HOME
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

THE
SANDFORD FLEMING
LIBRARY



Gift of
Dr. Stacy R. Warburton

H.T. Wallace

HOME UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
OF MODERN KNOWLEDGE

MOHAMMEDANISM

By D. S. MARGOLIOUTH
D.Litt.

London
WILLIAMS & NORGATE

HENRY HOLT & Co., New York
Canada: WM. BRIGGS, Toronto
India: R. & T. WASHBOURNE, Ltd.

HOME UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

OF

MODERN KNOWLEDGE

Editors:

HERBERT FISHER, M.A., F.B.A.
PROF. GILBERT MURRAY, D.LITT., LL.D., F.B.A.
PROF. J. ARTHUR THOMSON, M.A.

NEW YORK
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

MOHAMMEDANISM

BY

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH

D.Litt.

PROFESSOR OF ARABIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY 1962

LONDON
WILLIAMS AND NORGATE

SP
01
135
900z

OT 24
M33
m

PRINTED BY
HAZELL, WATSON AND VINEY, LD.,
LONDON AND AYLESBURY.

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
SANDFORD FLEMING LIBRARY

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I	THE ISLAMIC WORLD	7
II	MOHAMMED AND THE KORAN . .	42
III	THE ISLAMIC STATE	75
IV	ISLAMIC THEORY AND PRACTICE . .	115
V	ISLAMIC SECTS	154
VI	PREACHERS, SAINTS, AND ORDERS. .	193
VII	ISLAMIC ART, LITERATURE, AND SCIENCE	227
BIBLIOGRAPHY		253

29633

NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGY

It has sometimes seemed desirable in the following pages to date events by the Mohammedan era (A.H., *i.e.* the Year of the Flight, *hijrah*), which commences July 16, 622 A.D. Since the Years of the Flight are of 354 days, they do not coincide with our Solar Years. Rough correspondence can be obtained by the formula

$$\text{A.H.} - \frac{3 \text{ A.H.}}{100} + 621 = \text{A.D.}$$

(fractions being neglected). Thus $400 - 12 + 621 = 1009$; A.H. 400 began August 25, 1009 A.D. Similarly $1329 - 39 + 621 = 1911$. A.H. 1329 began January 2, 1911 A.D.

$$A.H = (A.D - 621) \times \frac{100}{97}$$

MOHAMMEDANISM

CHAPTER I

THE ISLAMIC WORLD

Islām is the infinitive, and *Muslim* or "Moslem" the participle, of a verb which signifies "to deliver" or "to commit entirely" some thing or person to some one else; authoritatively interpreted in this context as "to deliver the face to God," *i.e.* to turn to God only in prayer and worship, to the exclusion of all other objects of devotion. Hence the words are equivalent to "monotheism" and "monotheist." Their invention is ascribed in the Koran to Abraham, and the Christian apostles are said to have claimed this designation. There is, however, no historical evidence of their existence before the time of MOHAMMED, after whom the system is also called *Mohammedanism*, and who coupled with the proposition that God is One, "there is no God but Allah," another no less important: "Mohammed is the messenger of Allah." A Moslem or Mohammedan is, then, one who accepts the proposition that an Arab

named Mohammed or Ahmad, son of Abdallah, of the city Meccah, in Central Arabia, who died A.D. 632, is the main and indeed ultimate channel whereby the will of the Creator of the world has been revealed to mankind. This definition excludes persons like Carlyle or Bosworth Smith, who acknowledged that Mohammed was a prophet among many, but includes freethinkers in Mohammedan countries, so long as they ostensibly accept the system.

The number of Moslems in the world has been reckoned at 15·543 per cent. of its whole population. For 1906 this was calculated at about 233 millions, but it is only in countries which are under European administration that accurate statistics can be obtained. More than half this number are Asiatics—about 169 millions; more than a quarter Africans—about 59 millions; Europe is said to house only some 5 millions; America perhaps 50,000; Australia, with Oceania, some 20,000. Their numbers show a tendency to decrease in Europe, and to increase with the natural growth of population in Asia; in Africa, Islam is being steadily propagated among pagan tribes, and therefore increasing at a still greater rate.

The earliest mode of propagation was by persuasion, sowing the seed, to use the Gospel simile, yet not carelessly, like the Sower of the parable, but on soil which showed some

signs of receptiveness. In the eighth year of the Flight the Prophet addressed a manifesto to the world, demanding the submission of all mankind to Islam. Islam from that time onwards was in the main disseminated by the sword, for even where the conquered were not compelled to adopt it, they were reduced by rejection of it to a tributary caste. The missionary was not indeed unknown even in early times; but we shall probably be right in saying that when the system was most powerful, organization of missions was far more commonly in the interest of some sect within Islam than in the interest of Islam itself: *i.e.* the preacher addressed himself to Moslems rather than to Unbelievers. Yet the biographers of saints claim that conversions on a vast scale were effected by such persons' utterances or practice; and the great extension of the system in our times among African pagans is said to be due to the efforts of peaceful traders or colonists. Two other methods of acquiring adherents should be noticed. One is the purchase of children, said to be frequently done in China, when districts have been impoverished by plague or famine; our authorities speak of as many as 10,000 children being bought for the sake of replenishing the Moslem ranks on a single occasion. Another method, not very dissimilar, was the forcible seizure of young Christians, whereby the Ottomans for some centuries made up

their cohorts of Janissaries. Children, too, were taken as tribute by the Abbasid Caliphs from Turkestan, and purchased from various tribes for the bodyguard of the Egyptian Sultans.

"In the Wan district of the Bahr al-Ghazal Province," writes ARTIN PASHA, "a kind of propaganda by marriage, if not by slavery, is actively employed. One great factor in Moslem propaganda in the Sudan is the army, inasmuch as every heathen negro enrolled in one of the black battalions is first circumcised, then taught the Moslem creed, and lo! he is a Moslem." Yet the chief cause, natural increase, must not be forgotten. Although Mohammed cannot be charged with having instituted any worship of human fertility, such as was common in Asia, his system encouraged it to the very utmost. He held unhesitatingly that a human being was an asset to the community, and he made illegitimacy all but impossible. Hence families of 50, 70, or even 100 were not uncommon in Islamic countries, and probably are still to be found. The laws which govern human increase are indeed exceedingly obscure, but that the Islamic principles have at any rate at times had a tendency to multiply the population abnormally seems certain. Little, however, was ever done in these states to tabulate the results, and it is worth observing that one of the few Moslems who have investigated this subject—a writer of the fifth

century A.H., who anticipated the Higher Criticism in one of its objections to the story of the Exodus—states that he found fourteen an abnormally high number of children even in polygamous households. In modern times the increase is greater in protected than in autonomous Moslem communities, because of the greater number who survive. In the case of some races, *e.g.* the Ottoman Turks, inadequate increase, or even decrease, owing to unknown causes has occasioned the alarm of the Government. In many a province increase has been arrested through extreme misgovernment, as before the English Conquest in the Egyptian Sudan.

It has been the tendency of Islam, partly owing to the principle to which allusion has been made, to mix races; there being no difference in caste or rank between the son of the freewoman and the son of the bondwoman, the blood of the various races whence slaves have been bought or captured has mixed with that of the purchasers or conquerors. Hence the members of the same family will often present very distinct types; and racial purity, whether an advantage or a disadvantage, is rarely to be found in Islamic communities. In Arabia itself the breed is probably somewhat purer than elsewhere—that is, in the desert; in the towns there is the usual mixture due to the cause that has been specified, and to others. Beauty among

the Islamic peoples is chiefly due to admixture with Circassian blood, but also with Greek and Armenian; literary and scientific ability has usually been the result of the entry into Islam of Indo-germanic elements; the great Islamic authors are mostly Persians. The champions of Islam were at the first Arabs; in the third century of its existence its greatest fighters were found among its Turkish adherents, and this has continued ever since. Its mystical side has been developed in the main by Persians and Indians, but Africans and Spaniards have contributed something thereto. So far as it admits of an artistic side, that is to be found chiefly, if not entirely, in Persia.

It was not without a struggle, as will be seen, that Islam consented to de-Arabize itself. Its chief apostle after the Prophet wished Arabic to be the language of Islam, learned by none who did not accept the doctrine; its first hereditary dynasty refused to allow non-Arabs equal rights with Arabs. Not till the fourth century did Moslems compose in any language but Arabic; in our day there are many Moslem languages, differing widely in their affinities, yet all using varieties of the same script—Persian, Turkish in many dialects, Pushto, Hindustani, Malay, etc. Some have as yet little literature, such as Kurdish and Suahili; but when there are thoughts to be expressed, the Arabic alphabet provides the form for their expression. That alphabet

is uniquely suited to the language for which it was devised, and thus little suited to others, yet perhaps not less suited to any of them than is the Roman alphabet to English. And so all who can read at all can read the sacred book of their religion, which, whether it *may* be translated or not, *cannot* be translated; that is, cannot be de-Arabized.

Monotheism, polytheism, and the rest are not free from racial and climatic affinities, but these are too subtle to admit of analysis. Some indications of the former kind may be traced; no Asiatic nor African province which has been conquered by Islam has ever thrown it off, not even when it has come under Christian rule; in Europe it has secured no permanent abode. In Spain, in Sicily, in Malta, in Greece, it is a memory; in the very capital of Islam, Constantinople, a Greek patriarch last year claimed that his authority was paramount, and the boast met with only a gentle rebuke. The maintenance of Turkey in Europe was regarded by the Cabinets of Europe as a political necessity, requisite for the "balance of power"; yet it has been observed that each crisis provoked by a revolt of some of the Christian subjects of the Porte left the Ottoman Empire poorer by a province, whence the Moslems proceeded to emigrate. Had the presence of the Moslem power in Europe not been artificially preserved, it is likely that the boundary of Islam would by

now have been driven farther eastward. In 1737 the continuance of the Ottomans in Europe was thought to be due to the jealousies of Christian powers; but threatened men live long, and their expulsion, though repeatedly undertaken, was never carried out.

In the main, then, Islam is a religion of the *Heat Belt*, the part of the earth's surface which lies between 30° N. latitude and 30° S. latitude, with a mean temperature of 68 F. "During the past five hundred years," says Mr. ALLEYNE IRELAND, "the people of this belt have added nothing whatever to human advancement. Those natives of the tropics and subtropics who have not been under direct European influence have not during that time made a single contribution of the first importance to art, literature, science, manufacture, or invention; they have not produced an engineer or a chemist or a biologist or a historian or a painter or a musician of the first rank." Islam, however, has extended somewhat to the north of this Belt, which includes the whole of Africa, Arabia, the Malay Peninsula, and the Malay Archipelago; probably 41° or 42° marks its limit of extension northwards. And so far as Islam has produced literary monuments of the sort which Mr. IRELAND describes, their authors belong almost exclusively to those eleven or twelve degrees.

Islamic government is properly theocracy,

the rule of the community by God Himself, and so by His representative. It is difficult to conceive of any other authority coming between the Divine Being and His Viceroy, whence Islam contemplated imperialism from the first; it was only a question of enlargement of the area. Islam was to dominate every other religion; but within those other religions there might be degrees, some being more rebellious than others "against the Merciful." In spite of internal dissensions and civil wars, the dominion of Islam spread far in all directions; and it is difficult to dispute M. LE CHÂTELIER'S proposition that it was only in the nineteenth century that Christian powers began effectively to assert their superiority over Moslem powers, to reclaim some provinces and to assume the protectorate over others. Yet before the nineteenth century occasional reclamation had taken place; and there were, besides, countries wherein adherents of Islam had settled and multiplied, while acknowledging a non-Moslem government. Although then the world was properly divided into Islamic land and Hostile land, an intermediate territory had come from the force of circumstances to be practically acknowledged; viz. territory in which Islam was tolerated but not supreme.

It is almost a consequence of the monotheistic doctrine that there can be only one sovereign in the world at a time; just as,

according to the Koran, the simultaneous existence of two gods would have led to the ruin of heaven and earth, so two sovereigns must necessarily come to blows. But even in this matter logic had to give way to facts. It repeatedly happened that there were several Viceroys of God reigning simultaneously, and they were not always at war with each other. At times there has been an awkwardness when such sovereigns have wished to correspond, because it is a rule of etiquette that the superior puts his name before that of the inferior; but there have been expedients for even this difficulty. Probably since the close of the Umayyad period (the middle of the second century of Islam) the whole of Islam has never been under one nominal head. For many periods the nominal head possessed no effective control over the real ruler or rulers who acknowledged him. In one part of the Moslem world the Viceroy of God is himself unseen, a departed Messiah whose advent is awaited.

Thus it has arisen that of Islamic communities some are imperial, *i.e.* independent states, of which Islam is the official religion; others are protectorates, *i.e.* states of which Islam is the official religion, but which are not independent; while a third set of communities enjoy toleration in states which either have no official religion, or of which the official religion is not Islam. We shall enumerate

the communities in the above order, stating as briefly as possible how Islam came into the countries which they inhabit, and how they came under their present form of government.

The most important of the Islamic Empires is *Turkey*, of which the capital is Constantinople, in Europe, but which possesses territories in Asia and Africa also. Having been a despotism from its foundation by Osman, or Ottoman, son of Ertoghrul, after whom the nation is called Osmanli or Ottoman, in the year 1908 it became a limited monarchy. The constitution declares Islam to be the national religion, but provides complete toleration for other religions. The number of Moslems who are subjects of the Turkish Sultan was reckoned in 1910 at 10,000,000. He is, however, in virtue of his title *Caliph*, officially head of all the Moslems in the world, though not all recognize him as such. This title, which means literally *Vicar—i.e.* of God, or of the Prophet, or of the last Caliph—was handed over to the Sultan SELIM I. (1512—1520), when he conquered Egypt, by its last Arab holder. The rights which it confers at one time consisted in mention on coins and in public prayer. The Sultan's right of coinage of course no longer extends beyond the Ottoman Empire; but his name is mentioned in public worship by Moslems of some other countries, *e.g.* in parts of India.

The Ottoman Empire owed its rise to the weakening of the Byzantine Empire by the Crusaders, and the destruction of Islamic states by the Mongols. Starting as a vassal of the Seljuks of Asia Minor, the founder of the empire secured his independence and established a raiding state in the north of the peninsula. The weakness of their neighbours soon enabled the Ottomans to extend their conquests in all directions; and after making Brusa their capital for a time, they transferred it to Adrianople, on the European continent, and in 1453 took Constantinople itself. The conquests of the Mongol Timur, or Tamerlenk, who in the early fifteenth century devastated the nearer East, eventually strengthened the Ottomans, theirs being the only power there which had survived this storm. In the centuries which succeeded the taking of Constantinople, the Ottomans became the terror of Europe, and were involved in perpetual wars with Hungary and Austria; in 1529 and 1683 they besieged Vienna. They became masters of the whole of Greece, and held the coast of the Adriatic till well within the neighbourhood of Venice. The decay of their power in Europe is marked by the long war (1646—1669) with the Venetians, in which the Ottomans finally obtained Crete, over which they still exercise suzerainty; but the efforts required for these protracted hostilities may be said to have ruined both states. In the

nineteenth century their territory in Europe contracted till now little remains.

Persia was one of the earliest of the Moslem conquests, the fate of the Sassanian Dynasty, which held it before Islam was introduced, being settled in a brief campaign. Almost from the commencement, these new converts harboured convictions which differed somewhat from those of their Arabian brethren, and the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law, Ali, with his family, became the object of a kind of cult, at times limited to a recognition of his claim to be the Prophet's successor, at times amounting to a belief in his divinity. The restoration to the Prophet's family of the sovereignty, which for some centuries was held, nominally at least, by the Abbasids, was due to a revolution which broke out in Persia ; and the capital of that dynasty, Baghdad, had a Persian name. The throne, however, was mounted by the descendants of the Prophet's uncle, not of his daughter, though at one time alternation between the two branches was contemplated, and came near being realized.

After the destruction of the Abbasid power by the Mongols, a dynasty of the latter race, called Kans, governed the country, and adopted Islam. At the beginning of the sixteenth century this was ousted by a native of Azarbaijan, Ismail the Safawi, who not only brought the whole country under his sway,

but established Shi'ism, the Islamic doctrine which recognizes the title of Ali to the succession, as the state religion. As this it has remained, though the Persian dynasties have had little stability; the existing dynasty, the Kajars, was founded by AGHA MOHAMMED KHAN in 1794. The beginning of the twentieth century has witnessed an attempt to introduce constitutional government into Persia.

The empire of *Morocco* takes its name from the city Morocco (in Arabic *Marrakish*), founded in 1062 by the Almoravid Yusuf Ibn Tashifin. Islam had been introduced into North Africa as early as 646, when the eastern portion was raided by Abdallah Ibn Abi Sarh, whose efforts were followed by the foundation of Kairawan in 669, the taking of Tangier in 706 by Musa Ibn Nusair, and the invasion of Spain in 711. The propagation of Islam in this vast country was naturally a slow and difficult process; and besides internal dissensions the political condition of these communities had been greatly affected by the successive ruptures of the Caliphates. The empire founded by Ibn Tashifin is called by the Arabs "the extreme West" (Maghrib Aksa), and was extended by its founder over a great part of Spain, and by his successors far eastward, so as to include the modern Algeria, Tunisia, and Tripolitaine. At the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa in 1212 the Maghrebine power received a serious blow in

Spain, and by 1252 the Moslems had been driven out of the greater part of the peninsula; 1492 witnessed the termination of their rule in the country. Meanwhile the African empire of the Sultans of Morocco had been broken up by internal dissensions, and different dynasties were established in different provinces. Early in the sixteenth century Algiers was seized by Turkish adventurers, who were afterwards confirmed in their possessions by the Porte; and though temporarily ousted by the Spaniards, the Turks eventually gained possession of the greater part of North Africa. In the sixteenth century also there arose in Morocco the dynasty of the Sherifs, professing descent from the Prophet, and this dynasty still governs the country, though the capital was afterwards shifted to Fez.

Even in the case of these Islamic states, to which we have given the title imperial, the independence of the Government has been limited by conventions with European powers. These in the case of Turkey are called "capitulations," and the treaty made by the French King Francis I. with Sulaiman the Great in 1535 has served as the model for all subsequent agreements of the kind. The provision of greatest importance is that whereby the jurisdiction of a representative of their own Government, protected by the Government of the country, is secured for European aliens both in civil and criminal

affairs. "In Turkey," says Sir CHARLES ELIOT, "all foreigners enjoy almost the same immunities as diplomatists in other countries. Their domiciles cannot be entered by the Ottoman police without the consent of their respective Consular authorities, and notice must be immediately given to those authorities if any foreigner is arrested. Whenever a foreigner is tried, the Consul of his country (or a representative) must be present, and can protest against the sentence and prevent its execution if he considers it illegal. All suits between foreigners are tried in their own consular courts, and civil suits between foreigners and Ottoman subjects in mixed courts, at which a representative of the foreigner's Consul must be present. The taxes and dues which can be taken from foreigners are regulated by treaty, and cannot be increased or modified except with the consent of their Ambassadors or Ministers." Further, various treaties give the European concert the right to interfere in favour of the Christian nationalities subject to the Porte. "Turkey," says another diplomatist, "has been admitted into the European concert, but remains there in a state of tutelage."

Attempts have repeatedly been made by the Ottoman Government to get rid of this galling tutelage, the Turkish statesmen arguing that the capitulations were a free gift of the Sultans which it was in their power to

withdraw, whereas Christian diplomacy insists that they form part of a contract.

The condition of both Morocco and Persia approaches more nearly that of a protectorate. In the latter country more than two-thirds of the area is within British and Russian "spheres of influence"; this "influence" at times involving armed occupation. In the former France assists in administrative, economic, financial, and military reforms, and France, with several other European powers, has rights of interference scarcely compatible with the theory of a sovereign state. In both these countries arrangements are in force limiting the jurisdiction of native courts over European aliens, and the protection of European aliens is eagerly sought.

The total number of Moslems under Christian rule or protection was reckoned in 1906 at about 161 millions; of whom 81½ millions are subject to Great Britain, about 29¼ to Holland, about 29¼ to France, and some 16 to Russia. Next to these comes Germany, with some 2½ million Moslem subjects in Africa, while Italy, Portugal, and Spain rule over some ¾ million in the same continent. Some small European states account for the remainder. Although Great Britain is by far the greatest Moslem power in the world, it does not appear that our nation has ever colonized on Moslem territory, *i.e.* established permanent communities of its sons thereon. The British who

are to be found in Moslem lands are usually engaged on some temporary mission or employment, from the Governor-General downwards. The French, on the other hand, have established actual colonies in Algeria, though not in Tunisia, which they only protect. The former country, which sends deputies to the French Chamber, etc., may therefore be considered an extension of France. Similarly the Islamic countries occupied by Russia are part of Russia, and send representatives to the Duma; they are indeed contiguous to other portions of the empire. The Dutch conquests and administrative system bear a close resemblance to the British. Forcible conversion has scarcely been attempted by any of these nations, and little encouragement has ordinarily been given to proselytizing organizations. Thus in the Sudan Christian missions are forbidden to work among the Moslem population, and must confine their efforts to those districts where fetish-worship or paganism survives. Proselytism seems to receive rather more encouragement from the Dutch Government in Sumatra and Java than elsewhere, and the numbers of proselytes baptized yearly, as recorded by the missionaries, bears a larger proportion to the population in these islands than in other Moslem lands. The notion that proselytism from Islam to Christianity is unknown, or even that it is rare, is erroneous; in spite of diffi-

culties, the missionaries can show respectable figures for India, and some not wholly negligible for Africa.

The greatest Moslem communities subject to the English King are to be found in his Indian Empire, where, according to the statistics of 1901, 62½ million Mohammedans reside, constituting between a fourth and a fifth of the whole population. They are to be found in all the presidencies, provinces, and states, the largest proportion being in Eastern Bengal and Assam, the smallest in the Madras Presidency. The Hindus outnumber them by more than three to one.

The numbers of the Moslems in India are to be explained by a long series of invasions and immigrations from the West, and the causes which have been suggested above. As early as the year 44/664 an Arab force made its way into modern Afghanistan and took Kabul, making many proselytes ; and towards the end of the first Islamic century (89/714—96/717) the conquest of Sinde was definitely undertaken and successfully carried out. From Sinde the conqueror, Mohammed Ibn Kasim, advanced to Multan, the "Gate of India," which he took, winning vast booty. A governor of Sinde was appointed, whose capital was at Ror ; and under the reign of Omar II. (end of the first century of Islam and beginning of the second) numerous conversions were effected among the native

princes, many of whom, however, afterwards apostatized. Masudi records that in consequence of an outrage committed by a Sindian on a noble Moslem, the Caliph Hadi (A.D. 785–786) ordered the expulsion of all the natives from the country, whence the Sindians became as cheap as the Sardians once were. Casual raiding and attacks on Indian ports continued during the second and third centuries of Islam, but in the fourth and fifth the dynasty founded by Sabuktakin at Ghazni started on a definite policy of annexation.

Of the most famous monarch of this line, Mahmud, called "the empire's right hand," who died A.D. 1030, Sir WILLIAM HUNTER writes: "As the result of seventeen invasions of India, and twenty-five years' fighting, he reduced the western districts of the Punjab to the control of Ghazni, and left the remembrance of his raids as far as Kanauj on the east and Gujarat in the south. He never set up as a resident sovereign in India. His expeditions beyond the Punjab were the adventures of a religious knight-errant, with the plunder of a temple-city, or the demolition of an idol, as their object, rather than serious efforts at conquest. But as his father had left Peshawar as an outpost garrison, so Mahmud left the Punjab as an outlying province of Ghazni."

The first Moslem sovereign who had an Indian capital was the "Slave King" Kutb

al-Din, who proclaimed himself sovereign at Delhi in 1206; the whole of Northern India, "from the delta of the Indus to the delta of the Ganges," having by this time been subdued. Under the Khilji Dynasty (A.D. 1290—1320) Moslem power was extended into Southern India; and in the early years of the fourteenth century a general of the Moslem sovereign advanced as far as "Adam's Bridge," between the southern extremity of India and Ceylon, which had been visited by Moslem travellers many centuries before. In the fifteenth century the Moslem power in India broke up into a number of independent states, most of which were reunited into a great Indian Empire by the Moghul Akbar (1556—1605) and his successors. Akbar is famous for his toleration of other religions besides Islam, and indeed for an abortive attempt to institute an eclectic creed which should include elements drawn from all that were recognized in his empire.

The first interference of our country in Moslem affairs was, if Leo Africanus may be trusted, in 933, when the English seized and destroyed the sea-coast town of Morocco called Azilah, which had been wrested from the Goths by the Arabs in 713. Mr. Meakin thinks that by "English" here Norman pirates are meant. He also calls attention to the mention of a Moor (Mauritaniensis) in Domesday Book among the followers of William the

Conqueror. In the Crusades, wherein Richard I. played a historic part, our countrymen got to be known and feared by the Moslems of Syria. In 1578 Queen Elizabeth commenced negotiations with the Porte to enable English merchants to trade under the flag of their country (instead of the French flag) in Levantine harbours, and in 1583 regular diplomatic relations commenced between the two powers. The Queen even thought fit to identify the cause of Islam with that of Protestantism, on the ground of their common hostility to "idolatry."

The year 1608 saw the first arrival of a British vessel in Gujerat waters; in 1613 the English traders obtained a charter from the Great Moghul; in 1615 an ambassador was sent by James I. to the Indian monarch's court, and this representative obtained for them the right to build a house at Surat, where the English factory was established which marked the first permanent settlement in India of the power destined to be supreme in the country. Near the English house was a "Muskett or Moore Church," as a mosque is called in one of the quaint letters published by Mr. Forrest. In 1661 the island and harbour of Bombay were peacefully ceded by Portugal to Charles II., who presently sold them to the East India Company. We have no room for any further details of the wonderful story of British expansion in the Indian

continent, till this vast possession gave the British King the title of Emperor.

The history of *Afghanistan* is closely bound up with those of Persia and India, being, on account of its geographical position, the medium of communication between the two countries. Ghazni, the seat of the first Moslem conquerors of India, is in Afghanistan; but the consolidation of an Afghan nation and kingdom belongs to a far later period and is generally attributed to Mir Wa'iz, who in 1719 succeeded in establishing an Afghan dynasty which was for a time strong enough to overthrow that of Persia, but which presently was absorbed in the conquests of Nadir Shah. Ahmad Shah, the leader of Nadir Shah's Afghan contingent, was able, after the assassination of his master, to reassert Afghan independence in 1747; a descendant of his, Mahmūd Shāh, was dethroned by members of the family of his Vizier, Fathi Khan, in 1818, and one of this Vizier's sons, Dost Mohammed, in 1835 made himself ruler of Afghanistan, with the title Amīr al-Mu'minīn, "Commander of the Faithful," which had belonged to the ancient Caliphs. That title has been retained by his successors, though somewhat unsuitable for the governor of so small a portion of Islam. The Afghans are *Sunnīs*, a fact which has embittered their relations with Persia ever since Shi'ism became the official religion of that country. The first invasion of Afghan-

istan by British troops was in 1838, when the Indian Government resolved to dethrone Dost Mohammed, and replace a descendant of Ahmad Shah, owing to the former having entered into relations with Russia. By a treaty concluded at Gandamak on May 26, 1879, the Amīr agreed in future to conduct his relations with foreign states in accordance with the wishes of the British Government, which guaranteed to support him against foreign aggression.

Beluchistan, the ruler of which is called the Khan of Kelat, is also closely connected with the history of India and of Afghanistan. In the sixteenth century it was added to the dominions of Akbar, and in 1738 was conquered by Nadir Shah, who left the native ruler on the throne as his vassal. After his death Abdallah Khan rendered himself independent. The invasion of Afghanistan in 1838 brought the British Government into relations with the Beluchees, and a treaty was drawn up and signed; but its provisions were violated by the Beluchees, and a punitive expedition was in consequence sent to Kelat, which was entered by the British in 1839. By a treaty of October 1841, the Khan was declared a vassal of the Amīr of Afghanistan, and undertook to follow the advice of a British resident. For this, in 1854, a new agreement was substituted, by which the Khan entered into friendly relations with the British Gov-

ernment, and was not to enter without British consent into negotiations with foreign states. After a period of trouble and anarchy an agreement was signed in December 1876, whereby British agents, with suitable escorts, were to reside permanently at the court of the Khan, and elsewhere in the Khan's dominions.

Like the Afghans, the Beluchees belong to the Sunnite portion of Islam. The northern districts are said to be free from fanaticism, whereas the southern regions are said to harbour both fanatics and sectarians, and members of some of the religious orders which will meet us in Chapter VI. The population is estimated at under half a million.

Egypt was an early and an easy conquest of Islam, consummated in the twentieth year of the Flight. Dr. BUTLER, who has given a graphic account of the process, has endeavoured to clear the Copts of the charge of aiding the Arab invaders of their country; and indeed they revolted repeatedly. The stages whereby the Christian population was reduced to less than a tenth of the whole have not, indeed, been recorded, but they can be divined. Under some of the Moslem rulers the life of the non-Moslem was rendered so intolerable by ceaseless humiliations and vexations that the motive for conversion to Islam became overwhelming; and though, when the tyranny became less galling, a

certain amount of reversion to Christianity was permitted, not every one would care to make a second change. Further, where leakage is always in one direction, one of two vessels must gradually become empty, while the other fills; and whereas apostasy from Islam was, except in the case mentioned, punishable and punished with death, apostasy from Christianity was far more likely to be rewarded than punished, though theoretically at times it may have involved loss of property. Moreover, Egypt in Moslem times has been repeatedly colonized from Arabia, whereas no fresh Christian communities settled in the country.

Until the year 358/969 Egypt was, at any rate nominally, a province of the Eastern Caliphate, though its rulers more than once endeavoured to assert their independence, and even to found dynasties; in that year it became the seat of a rival Caliphate, with Cairo for metropolis, which lasted for some centuries; in 567/1171 it once more became in name a province of the empire whose capital was Baghdad. Less than a century after that date the Mongols put an end to the dynasty of Baghdad, and Cairo became the metropolis of Islam, where, under the protection of a Sultan, the representative of that dynasty maintained a shadowy existence; but in 922/1517 Egypt was taken by the Ottomans, and though Cairo retained its position as the

centre of Moslem learning, Constantinople took its place as the political capital of Islam.

The connexion of Great Britain with Egypt began at the time of the French occupation of 1798, which a British fleet had endeavoured to frustrate; in 1801 a British force invaded the country and restored Ottoman rule. The disturbances which followed on the departure of the English were finally quelled by the Albanian Mohammed Ali, founder of the dynasty in whose name government is still carried on; and his policy of Europeanizing the country, and more especially the borrowings of his successor, Ismail Pasha, brought it more and more under the influence of Europe, and particularly England and France. In 1882 the occupant of the throne accepted the help of Great Britain in quelling the insurrection of Arabi, and since that time our country has maintained an army of occupation in Egypt, and, while not interfering with Ottoman suzerainty, which is recognized by the payment of a heavy tribute, has either taken in hand or reformed the internal administration. On the other hand, the British Protectorate has been recognized by the Porte. Islam is maintained by the protecting power as the official religion of the country, to the extent, it is said, even of placing native Christians under various disabilities.

We come now to *French* protectorates. Under the Turkish domination, both nominal

and actual, Algiers had been a nest of corsairs, whom the great European nations sometimes endeavoured to chastise, while more often they made with them dishonourable terms. For some centuries French commerce in particular had suffered from the pirates, and in the time of Louis XIV. a series of armadas were sent against the Algerians with no decisive result. The French colonization of Algeria actually commences from April 20, 1827, when the French Consul was publicly buffeted by the Dey, as the head of the state was then called. In the year 1830 an enormous army and fleet were equipped with great care and expedition and sent to Algiers, the Dey of which determined to hold out against France in spite of the dissuasion of the Porte; on June 14 of that year a landing was safely effected at Sidi Ferrush, and on July 5 Algiers itself was taken. The French Government was at the time going through a serious crisis, and it would appear that there was at first no definite intention of founding an African Empire, or even of retaining possession of Algiers; but the place being once occupied, it could not be evacuated without loss of all that had been won by the effort, and its occupation led to the establishment of an empire. Bougie, the port of Kabilia, was occupied in 1832; in 1835 Tlemsen in the interior was seized; in 1836 Constantine was stormed. When once the French Government had resolved on the

creation of an African Empire, the realization of the idea advanced with great rapidity; as early as 1844 its possessions had been pushed to the frontier of Morocco, with which power it became involved in war: in that year Tangier was bombarded and Mogador temporarily seized. In 1881 Tunisia was also brought under French protection. The tendency is for the French sphere of influence, if not of actual possession, to extend farther and farther into the Sahara, as well as both eastward and westward. This African Empire has been acquired at great sacrifice of both blood and treasure. In its early days it encountered fierce opposition from a native chief, Abd al-Kadir, and the French reverses in the Franco-Prussian War led to a general insurrection.

The first collision between *Russians* and Moslems is said to have taken place A.D. 914, and in 944 some of the former captured from the Arabs Barda'ah, in Arran, at the extremity of Adharbaijan, an early conquest of Islam. As a power seriously menacing the independence of Moslem states, Russia first figured in 1722, when Peter the Great took Derbend on the Caspian and occupied Resht. The conquests of 1722 were surrendered in the years 1732–5, nor did the frequent collisions between the Tsars and Sultans in the eighteenth century lead to much acquisition by the former of territory occupied by Moslems. Between

the years 1786 and 1819 the whole of Daghestan came to recognize Russian sovereignty, in 1800 Georgia was united to Russia, and in 1806 Derbend and Baku were added to the empire of the Tsar. At the close of the Russo-Turkish War in 1878, Kars, Batum, and Ardahan were transferred from Ottoman to Russian rule. The Russian advance in Central Asia, which added a vast, though thinly peopled territory to the empire, took place mainly between the years 1863 and 1876, when the Government of Turkestan and the Trans-Caspian Province were created. Samarcand was seized in 1868. The Khanate of Khokand was embodied in Turkestan in 1876. The Mohammedan population now under Russian rule is variously estimated at from 14 to 16 millions. Some of these are to be found far north of the recent acquisitions, *e.g.* some two-thirds of a million in Kazan, where there is a flourishing Mohammedan press.

It would appear that Islam came to *Java* from the Malabar Coast, the first missionary being one Malik Ibrahim, who died A.D. 1419; he was followed by one Raden Rahmat, *ob.* 1467. As elsewhere, the advocates of the system commenced by peaceful persuasion, and afterwards resorted to force. In 1478 the chief Hindu power in Java was overthrown and Islam became dominant in both the southern and northern portions of the island.

Sumatra had also by this time been Islamized. The Moslems of Java follow the legal system of Shafi'i, therein it is said retaining a trace of their origin from a Malabar mission. The connexion of Holland with Java began in the middle of the sixteenth century, and in 1610 Batavia, the capital of Dutch Java, was founded. From that time Dutch influence steadily increased, and in 1749 one of the native princes abdicated for himself and his heirs the sovereignty of the country in favour of the Dutch East India Company. They could not at once enter upon their inheritance, but by 1758 acquired, after much fighting, general control over the administration of the island, and, reserving to themselves the direct government of all the provinces lying on the northern sea-coast, restored the inland and southern provinces to the native princes, who in 1808 were declared independent. In 1811 the island was occupied by a British force, but by the treaty of Paris it was in 1815 restored to Holland. The population of the neighbouring islands, which Holland has also gradually acquired, amounts to less than half that of Java and Madura. The number of Moslems who inhabit these islands is put at about 25 millions.

Of powers that are neither Moslem nor Christian, that which has the greatest number of Moslem subjects is *China*, though that number has been variously estimated. An

estimate of 1906 places it at 30 millions; Mr. MARSHALL BROOMHALL, in his monograph on Chinese Islam, of 1910, finds that it lies somewhere between 5 and 10 millions, and himself leans towards the higher rather than the lower figure. The province with the largest Moslem population is agreed to be Kansu, for which the estimates vary from 2 to 3½ millions. The traditions current in China as to the introduction of Islam into this vast country are as fabulous as anything to be found in hagiologies, and Mr. BROOMHALL appears to be the first to expose some fictions which his predecessors had accepted as historical. Although the Prophet of Islam is credited with the maxim "Seek knowledge even in China," he is unlikely to have heard the name of this possible hunting-ground; for when he despatched his missives to the sovereigns of his time, summoning them to accept Islam, he does not appear to have directed one to the Chinese Emperor. According to the Arabic historians, as early as 715 Kutaibah Ibn Muslim invaded Kashgar, and received a deputation from the Emperor of China demanding an account of Islam; Kutaibah accordingly sent some picked men, who exhibited to the Emperor and his Ministers the three states of the Moslem's life—his luxury in his home, his attitude in the presence of his sovereign, and his accoutrements in the field. The Emperor in alarm presented the

symbols which the Moslem general demanded. The nucleus of the Moslem population of China is said to have been a body of 4,000 men sent by the Caliph Mansur in the year 755 to the assistance of the Emperor Su Tsung, menaced by the rebel An Lu-shan. The Emperor, to reward them for their services, permitted them to settle in the chief cities of the empire, where they married Chinese women. Even on this matter the tradition exhibits various inconsistencies, but there is probably a groundwork of fact. Casual immigration during the succeeding centuries may have swollen the numbers of the Moslems resident in China; and the conquests of Jenghiz Khan, opening out the road to China, are said to have led to considerable accessions from the eastern provinces of Islam. The notices of their increase, and even of their existence, in China during the following centuries are exceedingly scanty, and in part apocryphal; but the famous traveller Ibn Batuta in the fourteenth century found Moslems settled in great numbers in the country, and even in possession of towns of their own. They were in the habit of paying the Alms, or poor-rate, enjoined by their religion, to visitors from Islamic countries, whence we may conclude that these communities were wealthy. They appear to have adopted a more respectful attitude to other religions than elsewhere, and to have

ordinarily been favoured by the Government until 1818, when the first Mohammedan insurrection in Yunnan broke out; but relations grew worse in the nineteenth century, and a Mohammedan insurrection in the same province, which began in 1856, was not finally crushed till 1872; while another, which broke out in Shen-si, lasted from 1862 till 1878. It appears that vast numbers of Moslems perished in these wars, and that their condition has generally deteriorated in consequence.

The states enumerated in these paragraphs include the bulk of the Moslem population of the world, but there remain a number of smaller communities, about whom a little should be said. In Arabia itself there are the Wahhabi states and the state of Oman, in close touch with the British Government of India; the area of British influence, extending inwards from the south, with the British protectorate of Somaliland on the opposite coast, and those of East Africa and Zanzibar farther south. Moslem Somalis, as well as Danakils and Gallas, are subject to Christian *Abyssinia*; other Moslems are to be found in the Abyssinian towns, chiefly as traders; travellers give a good account of their condition as compared with their Christian neighbours. "In our colonial empire," says M. Doutté, "we have a good example of Islam entirely changed and brought back to quite primitive beliefs in those Chams who founded the ancient

empire of Champa (now Annam), and who, driven back by the Chinese, the Cambogians, and the Annamites, subsist here and there in our Indo-China and Siam." These Chams are said to be originally Malays. In German Africa there are said to be over $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and in Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish Africa some $\frac{3}{4}$ million. Finally, in the new possessions of the United States, the Philippines, there are said to be 300,000 Moslems.

The answer, then, to the question Who are Moslems, or Mohammedans? has occupied considerable space. The first of these names in some form or other probably is recognized by them as theirs in all the languages which they speak; the form Muslim is preserved intact in some: in Turkish a Persian plural is often used as a singular, *Musliman*, whence comes the European *Musulman*.

CHAPTER II

MOHAMMED AND THE KORAN

From the definition of the name *Moslem* given above, it follows that the place filled by the founder in the system is exceedingly prominent; if it is man's business to obey God, it is from Mohammed only that his business can be learned. As compared with some other systems, Islam possesses great advantages for the application of this principle. The text of the Koran, or divine revelation, verbally communicated by the Prophet, was finally settled within thirty years of the latter's death; and though the earliest biography of him which we possess is one hundred and thirty years later, the bulk of it is connected with later history by continuous chains: many of the personages who figure therein played a historic part after their master's death; and in many cases the sources of the narrative can be traced with certainty. The amount, then, which negative criticism would reject could never be a considerable fraction of the whole; both eulogists and detractors are agreed as to the main facts of the career,

however much their judgment of it may differ.

Owing to the absence of written chronicles, the history of Arabia before Islam is exceedingly obscure; the difficulty of communication, and the poverty of the central portions of the peninsula, kept it away from the main currents of history. Its condition at the time when Islam arose is therefore imperfectly known. It is, however, clear that the bulk of the peninsula was still pagan, and indeed primitively pagan, the objects of worship being fetishes, which had names, but about which there was little theological speculation. One particular sanctuary, that of Bakkah (in the ordinary language Meccah), and its god Allah, had acquired fame by supernatural resistance to an Abyssinian expedition, of which the purpose had been destruction of the cult; and it seems that there was an arrangement between the tribes whereby warfare should cease for four months in each year in order to permit of safe pilgrimage to the sanctuary, whose keepers enjoyed various privileges. The process of pilgrimage came to involve a number of ceremonies, of which the meaning was naturally forgotten. Among the pagans there was in the main only tribal government, though at Meccah itself, the town that had grown up round the sanctuary, there were the beginnings of municipal government, as perhaps elsewhere. The two great empires

of the time, the Byzantine and the Persian, had their spheres of influence—the former in the north, the latter in the south of the peninsula, where indeed it appears to have maintained a governor; it seems doubtful, however, whether tribute was paid to either power.

Both Christianity and Judaism were represented in Arabia, and indeed in many provinces; a third monotheistic community, the Sabians, or Mandæans, also had representation. The Jewish tribes lay outside the ken of their Palestinian and Persian brethren; but for Islamic history posterity would not have known of their existence. Christianity, as the court religion of the Byzantine Empire, had been adopted in two states which disappeared shortly before the rise of Islam, and there were quite a number of Christian tribes; even in Meccah something seems to have been known of Christianity. Since the prosperity of the place was due to the carrying trade, the participators in which regularly visited Syria and Yemen, and at times perhaps Egypt and Abyssinia, the Meccan merchants on their travels had the opportunity of learning about it in Christian cities. Moreover, the modern Arabic script appears to have become known in Meccah about the time of Mohammed's birth, and this fact facilitated the introduction of the Christian or Jewish scriptures.

Mohammed, when he first meets us, is in

middle life. He belonged to a numerous and apparently powerful clan in his native city; several of his near relations, his uncles, aunts, and cousins, play an important part in his career. We know the name of his first wife, Khadijah, said to have been fifteen years his senior, yet the mother of a considerable family —four daughters and one or more sons. The son or sons died in infancy, but the daughters lived to maturity, and were all married to men of note. He seems, like most of the Meccans, to have carried on a trade; at first, we are told, that of conducting or accompanying caravans, afterwards that of selling dry goods retail. We even know the name of his partner in the latter business.

In studying the work of a prophet it is necessary to distinguish the historical from the theological attitude. What the Prophet claims is to be absolute dictator to his community; and if there have been communities in which the prophets were content with a humbler rôle, it is because in them the initiative came from the questioner, who was at liberty to reject the divine mandate when it was intelligible, though of course at his own risk. Thus the Greek oracles communicated the wishes of the gods, but only when they were questioned, and demanded a fee for their services. The Hebrew prophets appear to have aimed somewhat higher; the initiative ordinarily came from them, but they did not

aim at displacing existing authority, though they demanded that it should be guided by their advice. The part to be played by a prophet was suggested to Mohammed by a few cases wherein the divine messenger was also the founder, leader, and legislator of a community. Where those to whom such a claim is addressed dispute it, the theological attitude is that of sympathy with one of the parties; it either brands the disputers as stiffnecked and bigoted or the prophet himself as an impostor. And where the prophet claims supernatural powers, it is difficult to avoid holding one or other of these opinions. An Isaiah who could make the shadow on a sundial go back might well claim the obedience of his community; an Isaiah who made it appear to go back by some artful contrivance would be a disreputable charlatan. But in Mohammed's case no miracle of this convincing kind was claimed during his lifetime; for in whatever sense the miracle of the Koran be interpreted, command of either language or archæology is a different thing from command over the forces of nature. It is quite possible for one critic to find ideal eloquence where another is not even moved to admiration. Hence the historical attitude, which sympathizes with both sides, admits of easy application in dealing with the origins of Islam.

It is quite clear that reforms have ordinarily been effected by men who believed absolutely

in the efficacy of their expedients; it is also clear that none of these expedients have ever been as wholly beneficent in their results as the reformers had hoped. It must also be remembered that the scientific settling of moral values is a matter of slow growth, and that many a prophet has in consequence assigned what seem to us wholly disproportionate values in his assessment of acts. Thus probably the most violent language with which crime was ever denounced has been launched against idolatry, which does not obviously harm society, or sabbath-breaking, which few communities have regarded as even immoral.

If we attempt to sum up the evils current in Meccah which roused the Prophet's deepest indignation, they seem to have been of three classes.

One set were theological, *i.e.* false notions about the Divine Being, and a system of superstitious ceremonies. The latter were some harmless, some silly, and some disgusting. The Prophet swept them all away, just as the Founder of Christianity swept away the Mosaic law of purity; His disciples would eat meat without washing their hands. Such of these taboos as are recorded are usually connected with the camel, which was the basis of Meccan civilization. In general, however, Mohammed seems to have abhorred the Meccan beliefs more than the Meccan practices. The former, being known to us

only from the statements in the Koran, are in the highest degree obscure; it is certain that there were minor deities, mostly goddesses, who were privileged in some way above the chief Deity, Allah, to whom the sanctuary and in the main the people of Meccah belonged. The true religion was, in Mohammed's opinion, that of the founder of the community, Abraham and his son Ishmael, and it was his function to restore the ancient purity of the cult. It is a psychological puzzle that this destroyer of idols maintained the ceremony of kissing the Black Stone, which at any rate bears a close resemblance to idolatry. But however that may be explained, the Prophet seems from the first to have waged implacable war against idols, and never rested till he had banished their cult from Arabia.

A second set of evils might be described as social. The society of Arabia was founded on the theory of the joint responsibility of the tribe, especially for bloodshed; and it would seem that the death of a tribesman at the hands of a member of another tribe led to a long and complicated series of battles and assassinations, the purpose of which was not to gain any decisive results, such as the acquisition of territory or the subjugation of a community, but retaliation with interest. When the warring communities got tired or exhausted, the numbers of slain on either side

were counted up, and any surplus paid for. The distinction between voluntary and involuntary slaughter seems to have been wholly ignored. Either, then, a tribe lived in a perpetual state of warfare, or the fear of this internecine strife caused impunity in crime. That there was need for reform in this matter, and that such reform could only be effected by the complete destruction of the tribal system and the substitution for it of orderly government, is obvious.

We gather too from the Koran that much injustice was prevalent in Meccah, and that there were various disabilities from which chiefly strangers suffered.

Thirdly, there were offences against morality which very rightly shocked the Prophet. Most notable amongst these was infanticide, the horrible practice of burying girls alive. Doubtless the Arabs in the main were endeavouring by this practice to deal with the problem of a surplus female population, which in modern times also occupies the attention of thinkers; but that in reprobating the custom Mohammed was helping on the cause of good is clearly true. That there was also much irregularity of morals in Meccah is historically attested, yet the nature of the innovations cannot be precisely made out. Perhaps the formula "regulation of sexual relations" would be sufficiently precise and sufficiently vague to describe what was done.

The task, then, which the Prophet set himself—or, if the phrase be preferred, received—was the execution of a scheme of theological, social, and moral reform. To a certain extent a reformer is less an innovator than an interpreter of the ideas of his age; to a certain extent his work has to be experimental, and even opportunist: he has not an answer ready for every question which arises.

The stages of the Prophet's career become clearer after the Flight to Medinah; before that epoch, which afterwards became the era of Islam, they are faint. He commenced by an appeal to his own household, and won converts in his wife Khadijah, his adopted son, his young cousin Ali, and his uncle Hamzah. For a period of three years the mission was conducted privately: meetings were held in secret, and, unless the religious observances of the Meccans differed very much from those of other communities, some external participation in the national worship must have been maintained by both the Prophet and his followers. Conversion of persons who were not of the privileged caste was comparatively easy, and several adherents were won from among these: but some persons of importance also joined. One of the earliest adherents was Abu Bakr, son of Abu Kuhafah, afterwards the Prophet's father-in-law and his first successor, said to be an authority on Arabian pedigrees: a man of unswerving loyalty, ready

to fulfil all the obligations which the most uncompromising theorists ever demanded of a friend, yet not honoured with that name by his Master; but also a man of astuteness, of forethought, of resolution. Unlike his three successors, also early adherents of the Prophet, he died in his bed. Othman Ibn Affan, the third successor, married successively two of the Prophet's daughters; he seems to have been a respected personage, who, till he became sovereign, made few enemies. Omar, the second successor, converted after the mission had been made public, and when its fortunes were at a low ebb, is represented as the strenuous partisan, who persecuted the sect before he joined it. His accession to the cause in its early days turned the scale in its favour just as the battle of Badr did after the Flight; titles, indicating this service, were conferred both on him and it.

At the end of these three years some open breach occurred, and the pagan Meccans were astonished that one of their number claimed to be the messenger of their God, bringing them a strange message, wholly subversive of their former beliefs and practices: claiming, in short, to be their dictator, though dictating not his own words, but God's. There is no example in history of such a claim being at the first favourably received, unless by any chance it is made by one already sovereign. In most communities it has meant death, or

at least condign punishment, for the person who makes it. The better the order of the community, the less chance has a prophet. The execution of Socrates took place after a legal trial, in the most highly civilized and most tolerant state of antiquity. The charge was that Socrates did not worship the city's gods and shook other people's belief in them. The Book of Deuteronomy urges that the man who introduces a new cult should be stoned without mercy and without a hearing. Some citizens of Baghdad a few months ago clamoured for the execution of a man who preached the equalization of the sexes in defiance of the Koran. People suppose that the favour of the gods is necessary for the well-being of their communities: if the gods are offended, their vengeance falls not upon the individual offender, but upon the community, taking the form of plague, famine, or defeat in war. Hence it is with the view of self-preservation that the community defends the honour of its gods.

The problem, then, is not why did Mohammed for eighteen years fail to convince the bulk of his citizens? but, How was it that he escaped death when once his mission had been proclaimed? And the reply is, Because there was no orderly government. In the first place it seems clear that all Meccah was *sanctuary*, no blood might be shed there under any pretext: when first the Prophet became

dangerous, the Meccan plan was to *starve* him to death. Justice, it would seem, could only be executed within the tribe, and the tribe seems to have recognized the authority of some sort of patriarch: the patriarch of Mohammed's tribe was his uncle, Abu Talib, who accorded protection to his nephew, without acknowledging his mission. For some time, then, it was possible to attack the adherents of the Prophet, while impossible to assail the Prophet himself. For such an assault would have led to civil war between the Meccan tribes, a consequence which it was their common interest to avert.

For his persecuted followers the Prophet presently succeeded in finding a refuge in Axum, the capital of Christian Abyssinia, where a few fell away to Christianity, but most remained Moslems, in the wretchedness of exile, till recalled in triumph some fourteen years later, when Arabia was fast becoming Mohammed's. It is creditable to the obscure potentate of Abyssinia that he should so long have tolerated a community whose opinions evidently differed on some important matters from his, and that he should have refused the demand for their extradition made by wealthy Meccans and enforced with presents. Naturally the latter were enraged by this diplomatic success of the Prophet, and proceeded to the measure which has been mentioned—the blockade of the whole clan of

Abu Talib, who were to be starved into submission. The blockade seems to have terminated with the death of the patriarch, whose successor, apparently Abbas, eponymus of the Abbasid Dynasty, was less quixotic than his brother. Mohammed fled in consequence from Meccah to Taif, where he attempted an abortive mission; nor did he venture to quit the hospitality of the place until he had, after many failures, secured the protection of another Meccan patriarch.

But the notion of reconquering Meccah from the outside having once suggested itself to him, his chance lay in finding a refuge with some of the tribes who presented themselves at the sanctuary in the pilgrim month, and many further negotiations were started before chance or providence brought him what he required. That a city should actually require a *prophet of the Rahman* was not to be expected, but it occurred. In Yathrib, where there were Jews who called God by this name, and civil war waged between the two Arab tribes Aus and Khazraj, the accession of a Jewish force—ordinarily, of course, the Jews would not fight—had turned the battle of Bu'ath in favour of the former; in other words, the Rahman had given victory to the Aus; the Khazraj had sent envoys to Meccah to implore aid, and found there "a prophet of the Rahman" who was in a position to make a permanent peace. There is reason

for believing that the Jews readily accepted this solution of the difficulty, since what they wanted was peace and quiet, and these were all the more welcome with honour. The Prophet, whose selection of agents was extraordinarily felicitous, sent a trusty follower to represent him at Yathrib, where conversions began to take place with extraordinary rapidity. Refuge and hospitality were offered by the new converts, henceforth called the *Helpers*, to their persecuted brethren of Meccah, to be called the *Refugees*. Gradually, as the news came of the progress of affairs at Yathrib, they slunk away thither, till only the Prophet and a few of his immediate adherents or relatives remained. And then only did the Meccans learn what was taking place, viz. that the Prophet whom they had persecuted had been offered and had accepted the tyranny of a city which could intercept their Syrian caravans.

There are dangers in the presence of which all scruples are abandoned, and at this crisis the Meccans resolved to shed blood, first making an arrangement whereby the guilt should be spread over as large a number of tribes as possible, and indeed taking so many precautions that the time passed in which the act could have been perpetrated. The Flight from Meccah to Medinah taxed to the uttermost the resourcefulness, the astuteness, and the daring of both the Prophet and Abu Bakr,

and to some extent of Ali, but they were equal to the demand. The first two were secure for three days in a cave south of Medinah while the Meccans were searching every path that led to the north. The Meccans confiscated the property of the Refugees; but their war was in future to be not with a sect, but with a state.

The coincidence of Mohammed's arrival at Kuba, a few hours from Yathrib (afterwards known as "the City," *i.e.* Mohammed's City), with the Jewish Day of Atonement, gives us the date September 20, 622, for this event, and is one of the few definite synchronisms which the history of this period offers.

The seizure of the Moslems' goods and the attempt on the Prophet's life undoubtedly justified him in regarding his relations with the Meccans as a state of war, giving him the right to waylay their caravans.

At Medinah it was his object to conciliate the different parties, and so far as possible unite them, in some cases by establishing artificial brotherhoods, in others by extinguishing the memory of past disputes. The principle which he adopted and even formulated was that man's conscience was God's concern: he was a Moslem who professed Islam. Although, then, during the whole of his despotism there was a disaffected party among the Arabs, called in the Koran "the hypocrites," or "the sick-hearted," their ostensible accept-

ance of Islam secured them the mildest possible treatment. With the Jews, on the other hand, various compromises were attempted; they failed because the Jews obstinately refused to acknowledge his prophetic title, and regularly taunted him with ignorance of the Scriptures which he claimed to confirm. Moreover, he regarded them as useless for military purposes, and (except as bankers) utterly untrustworthy. His judgment was shown by their conduct to be sound; hostilities between him and them broke out ere he had been despot of Medinah for a year; the various Jewish tribes refused each other assistance, whence he was able to deal with them one by one, his measures becoming severer after each victory. The tribe which he left till the end was massacred to a man in the year 5. The reader of these narratives fancies himself with Josephus at the siege of Jerusalem. The same qualities which ruined the revolters against the Roman power ruined the Jewish tribes which opposed Mohammed.

Those Moslem historians seem right who assert that Meccah was the key to Arabia, and that if the Prophet was already planning the conquest of the latter, it was necessary for him to take Meccah first.

For the first five years of the Medinah period, then, the Prophet was occupied mainly with his enemies of Meccah, who nerved themselves to great efforts, which, however, were

frustrated by the Prophet's superior ability and the discipline and earnestness of the Moslems. The Meccan leader, Abu Sufyan, father to the founder of the Umayyad Dynasty, had no influence over his followers compared with that of Mohammed; and his timid and incompetent generalship appears to have paralysed the Meccan fight for independence. The series of events consisted in a pitched battle in the year 2, at Badr, caused by a raid on a Meccan caravan. The caravan escaped, but the army sent to succour it came to an engagement with Mohammed's host, and, though somewhat superior in numbers, was defeated with considerable loss. The following year the Meccans invaded Medinese territory with the view of avenging their defeat; they were satisfied with killing a number of Mohammed's followers equal to the victims of Badr, and returned when this exploit had been accomplished. The constant and successful raiding of their caravans by Mohammed led to a vigorous assault on Medinah in the year 5, the Meccans being aided by a powerful confederation of Arab tribes. Mohammed, however, succeeded in sowing dissension among them, and bad weather did the rest. The confederates broke up, having accomplished nothing. The next three years were marked by a series of peaceful negotiations ending with the capitulation of Meccah. During the course of them the leading men, weary of

Abu Sufyan's incompetence, had one by one joined the victorious side, till at last Abu Sufyan himself joined it. In dealing with his countrymen, the Prophet, in accordance with Koranic doctrine, began with severity, and then became gentler and gentler; his proscription list when Meccah capitulated was reduced to two.

In Medinah itself the Prophet had to deal with three parties, which gradually were extinguished. These three were pagans, Jews, and disaffected converts. The first disappeared shortly after his arrival; paganism was not to be tolerated in Medinah or elsewhere. With the second he did his best to make terms; it was impossible, and the Jews were therefore exterminated. The disaffected converts gave occasional trouble, but their leader seems to have been cowardly and incompetent, and these too had ceased to count as a party by the end of the Prophet's life.

The conception of converting Arabia probably arose, as has been seen, before the end of the Meccan period, when the Prophet was temporarily exiled to Taif, and after his return to Meccah was compelled to devote his proselytizing efforts to foreign visitors at the feasts. It was not, however, before the eve of the taking of Meccah that he was conscious that his mission extended not only to Arabia, but to the world; and he despatched a number of missives to all known potentates bidding them

embrace Islam. The missives appear to have been effective in South Arabia, and not without results in Abyssinia and Egypt; in Persia and the Byzantine Empire their effect was less noticeable. It would appear, however, that in the latter case the message led to the first struggle between Moslems and Byzantines, culminating after the Prophet's death in the seizure by the former of some of the fairest provinces of the empire.

It does not lie within the province of this work to treat in further detail the events of this extraordinary career, which terminated on June 6, 632. These have been narrated over and over again by friends, by foes, and by neutrals. Those who can express no approval of his moral qualities cannot refrain from admiring his intellectual ability; and it might seem uncertain whether the quality of persistence admirably displayed by him in the maintenance of an opinion against fierce opposition, for a number of years, should be reckoned to the head or to the heart.

Although, as has been seen, there were various reasons which led to the accurate preservation of much of the Prophet's biography, it is not surprising that a legendary biography should also grow up and gradually become imbedded in the genuine material. The thirst after the wondrous was not sufficiently gratified by a record which for the most part deals with commonplace causes and

effects. There were, indeed, in the original biography a few places in which supernatural beings, angels and demons, had played a part; but it was a modest one, scarcely, if at all, affecting the course of events. The Prophet, besides the miracle of the Koran, to be presently considered, had scarcely done anything publicly that could be called miraculous; he rarely even foretold the immediate future. His contact with the supernatural had in the main been confined to private experiences, of which the most remarkable was his ascent into heaven, or at least his miraculous transference from the Temple in Meccah to the "Furthest place of prostration," *i.e.* the Temple of Jerusalem, long before destroyed; on which perhaps a new light is thrown by that ADVENTURE published this year, by two ladies who were transferred at Trianon to the days of Marie Antoinette. Similarly subjective was the miracle whereby he had preached to and converted certain of the *Jinn*. Since the founders of other systems were known to have shown more striking signs and wonders, many felt that here was a gap in the prophetic biography which ought to be supplied. Of the stories which owe their origin to this feeling some have obtained wide circulation, *e.g.* that he fed multitudes miraculously, and that he split the moon.

But there are many which have acquired less celebrity, but are to be found recorded

in the works of the pious. One, called *The Removal of Grief*, composed some three hundred years ago, is a mine of them. One Tha'labah, we are told, asked the Prophet to pray that his wealth might increase; the Prophet declined twice, but the third time yielded to the request. Immediately Tha'labah's flocks and herds grew so numerous that there was no room for them in Medinah, and he had to find a valley for them, etc. At a comparatively early period the Ascent to Heaven lent itself to amplification in a variety of ways. M. LE CHÂTELIER records a tradition that on this night the Prophet was led by his conductor, the Angel Gabriel, into a palace sparkling with jewels, where was a box containing garments of various colours. The Prophet brought these garments down with him, and after having worn them himself transmitted them to his favoured disciples, who handed them on. This is the origin of the coloured stuffs worn by the ascetics.

Besides the Prophet's works, his qualities and privileges became a popular subject of study and exercise for the imagination. The character of saint and ascetic was substituted for that of the commander, statesman, and man of affairs.

We proceed to describe the miracle which he certainly claimed, the Koran.

Islamic Notion of Revelation.—The Word of

God is regarded by Islamic theology as literally God's composition, whence the Divine Being is cited as an authority for grammatical forms and rhetorical figures. The theory of "colouring by the medium," adopted by Christian theologians in order to explain discrepancies in their Scriptures, is wholly unknown to Islamic orthodoxy. The language of the Koran is God's language, and its eloquence is miraculous; any one who tries to rival it can prove that for himself. And being the communication of the All-wise, it is an infallible guide to conduct; the authority for both statements and precepts is paramount. It is therefore absolutely and uniquely consistent; inconsistency, which would have been the sign of human effort, cannot be found in it.

Although it is unlikely that we possess the whole Koran, *i.e.* revelations produced from the beginning to the end of the Prophet's mission, this theory of its nature seems to have prevailed from beginning to end. In what is supposed to be the earliest revelation God declares that he has "taught man with the pen, taught him what he did not know." To teach with the pen is evidently to write a book for general guidance, and the Koranic view is that the earlier revelations were of the same sort. The fact that the Jewish and Christian Scriptures are written in a style which conflicts with this theory is to the Moslem an argument against their genuineness.

The main difference between the ancient book and the modern is that the seat of the former was the mind, the seat of the latter is the paper. In works emanating from Jewish circles we can trace the effects of this. "How readest thou?" in the New Testament means "What is the written text?" implying that in this case there was an authentic copy somewhere; whereas had the question been, "How recitest thou?" it would have implied that there was none. The "Word of God" is therefore thought of as the two Tables of Stone were thought of—as an authentic but concealed record; and J. SMITH'S idea of the original of the "Book of Mormon," *i.e.* Tables of gold containing characters which he could only read by the grace of God, was the same. To this eternal record, "the well-guarded Table," the Koran was referable; the process by which it became communicated to Mohammed might be different at different times or be thought of differently. In the main the prevailing opinion is that the Angel Gabriel communicated its contents to Mohammed in a trance, but Gabriel is sometimes represented as taking human form, and indeed the form of a well-known man. Usually, however, the Prophet was in trance when revelations were communicated, and they were taken down by trustworthy scribes.

General Character of Revelation.—The prophetic style is ordinarily ejaculatory, and a

case of a continuous paragraph is noticed as exceptional in the Koran itself. This feature it shares with the two styles of Arabic literary art, which are thought to be earlier than the Koran, rhymed prose and verse. In the former the unit is a couplet—which may be extended—of sentences ending with the same consonant: "I would not *care* In such an enterprise to *share*" would illustrate this style. In the latter the unit is a couplet of sentences *rhythmically* alike. If, however, several verses are joined to make a poem, they must all rhyme in the same letter. Some passages of the Koran, but not many, show signs of the union of both systems. The following is a noteworthy example:

alam nashraḥ laka ṣadrak
wawaḍa'nā 'anka wiẓrak
warafa'nā laka dhikrak

Ordinarily, however, the former system only is in use, and in the later revelations the rhyme is limited to *ūna* or *īna*, which is furnished by many grammatical inflexions. The rhyme, however, is in all cases far looser than that which the literary style called rhymed prose permits.

Hence it is denied that the Koran is either in rhymed prose, or in verse; it is in a style *sui generis*, which is inimitable. If we had merely the evidence of language before us, we should undoubtedly argue that both rhymed prose and verse were later than the Koran,

and represent a later stage of evolution. The present writer is not convinced that this is not the case, but it cannot be discussed here.

Contents of the Koran.—A branch of the later Koranic literature consists in treatises on the *Occasions of Revelation*, *i.e.* accounts of the historic occasions in the Prophet's life when texts were revealed. The later we get in the Prophet's career the more certain such tracing becomes. At times the persons to whom they refer are mentioned in the text—*e.g.* the Prophet's wives and his adopted son Zaid; or the allusions to events are unmistakable—*e.g.* the battles of Badr and Hunain, the taking of Khaibar, the taking of Meccah, the exclusion of pagans from the pilgrimage, the building of the rival mosque at Kuba. Hence SPRENGER compared these portions of the Koran with the modern leading articles on current events in the official chronicle of a government. But the earlier we go back in the Prophet's career the less certain do such allusions become. In one case indeed a personal name—Abu Lahab, said to belong to an uncle of the Prophet—figures in an imprecation, and the Persian conquest of the nearer East is mentioned in a prophecy. Even in these days only a high degree of education or unusual critical ability enables a man to distinguish between historic truth and historic conjecture; in the greater number of cases these identifications of occasions are conjec-

tural, and even among orthodox Moslem writers they have no good name. The earlier revelations appear to be *oracular*, ejaculations, brief admonitions or warnings, whether directed to the Prophet himself or intended for others. There are also some brief historical pictures, naturally pointing morals. The main doctrines of Islam, the Unity of God, the Future Life, with certain moral precepts, are also found. Some few are personal, and may be said to refer to the psychology of the Prophet. The intermediate revelations, *i.e.* those from the public promulgation of Islam to the Flight, are homiletic, very largely the "Stories of the Prophets," *i.e.* accounts of the mission of various prophets, both Hebrew and Arabian, and the vengeance which fell on those who disobeyed them. One Surah, which deals with Gospel history, is supposed to belong to the time of the Abyssinian Exile, and to have been an account of the Islamic theory of the nature and work of Christ for communication to the Abyssinian King. Some portions must have been intended for liturgical use, but about this little certain is known; some legislation, though little, also belongs to this period. The revelations after the Flight are either legislation, in some cases minute, or in the style of political manifestos; the bulk of the second Surah, which is regarded as the most eloquent of all, is of this type. The nature of the arrangement of the Koran

is such that the historical order of the Surahs is much more nearly from end to beginning than conversely.

Preservation of the Koran, and Probability of its Authenticity.—One fact that emerges from a study of our authorities is that the Prophet kept no official copy of his revelations. The teachers of the Koran had, like other teachers of the time, to satisfy themselves that their pupils had committed certain portions to memory; and when we hear of as many as seventy missionaries being sent to a single tribe—doubtless the ordinary round number—the multitude is explained by this consideration. But when once the matter was committed to memory, the material on which it was written was of no further use. The real Koran was on the "Well-guarded Table": those who took down the matter communicated to them by the Prophet did so only as a temporary expedient. The project of collecting it is said to have originated with Omar, the second Caliph, after the Prophet's death. It met at first with serious opposition on the ground that it was *ultra vires* to endeavour to do what the Prophet might have done, but had not; and when Abu Bekr agreed, the task of collecting it was found to be of great difficulty: for where was it? *In people's breasts*, unless there happened to be an ostrakon, or bit of parchment or of papyrus here and there containing a memorandum of it.

Zaid Ibn Thabit was entrusted with this work, and he compiled an official copy, only intended for the sovereign's use. We have no memoir of his procedure, but he is supposed to have settled the text by the principle which underlies the later treatment of Tradition—credibility of witnesses. The Korashite dialect was declared to be the true language of the Koran: doubtless there were differences between that and the dialect of Medinah.

The main difficulty of the Koran in its existing form is the import of the word *Surah*, or Chapter. The origin of the word, which is employed in the Koran itself, is unknown; most probably it means a *layer*, or *course* of bricks in a wall, the bricks of which must in certain ways—*i.e.* at least two dimensions—be symmetrical. Rhythmical agreement between the texts, *āyāt*, literally signs or miracles, of each separate chapter only exists to a rudimentary extent; and it is generally admitted that the Surahs contain materials belonging to different dates. It seems difficult to think of any theory of their construction which is not unnatural. The task of arranging the sacred texts in fixed groups might very well have appalled a Moslem; we could scarcely credit a contemporary of the Prophet with having the courage to attempt it. On the other hand, the notion that the Surahs existed as frames, which gradually became filled as revelations descended, has little to commend

it, and involves the existence of an official copy, which we have seen to be excluded by the evidence.

The work of the third Caliph was to provide a public edition. The reason appears to have been that unofficial copies were being circulated in the vast regions which were being, or had been, won over to Islam, and for which copies of the Sacred Book had become indispensable. All these were destroyed, and official copies despatched to the chief capitals. The same editor was employed, perhaps because, in the extreme ambiguity and imperfection of the Arabic script, he alone could interpret the first edition with certainty. Whether there was any fresh revision at this time is unknown. There is at best reason for thinking that some of the controversies which cropped up within the score of years following the Prophet's death left traces in the volume. The traditions preserve fragments of the edition of the Koran by learned followers of the Prophet, but the variations which they offer are slight, and it is likely that the Caliphs chose the best man who could be found for the purpose.

The official copies were, after all, only *memoriæ technicæ*. One who had read the text with a teacher would afterwards be able to check his memory thereby; one who saw the text for the first time would be confronted with an enigma. Towards the end of the century such improvements were introduced

into Arabic writing as would enable a man acquainted with the language to make it out for himself. Yet certain systems of intonation were introduced, which were considered necessary for liturgical purposes; the Koran, if otherwise intoned in prayers, would have no value. Whether the Jewish system of accentuation comes from this Islamic doctrine or conversely is not certain. The systems permissible were afterwards stereotyped as seven or ten. These of course can only be acquired orally.

Interpretation of the Koran.—Of the Sacred Book the least intelligible portion consists in certain letters of the alphabet prefixed to a certain number of Surahs; they are pronounced like our letter-names (*aitch*, *zed*, etc.). Much ingenuity has been spent on solving this enigma; most probably they are no more than what they profess to be, trials of the pen or voice before starting the writing or recitation: probably of the latter, since very early traditions treat them as part of the revelation. The meaning of the text is otherwise ordinarily simple and clear; there are few archaisms in the sense of obsolete and obscure words: nevertheless the Koran offered many opportunities for commentary. Since it divides itself into two parts, the distinct and the equivocal, or the genuine and the doubtful, it was a matter of necessity to know to which portion any text belonged. There

is reason for thinking this division identical with the division into valid and abrogated; for that texts could be revealed and afterwards abrogated is distinctly stated in the volume, and the theory of abrogation is defended by the procedure of the Christian revelation. If Christ could abrogate the Mosaic law, Mohammed could abrogate the Christian; and since God's ordinances could have merely temporary value, there was nothing to extend their duration necessarily to an age: it might be limited to some days. It is also hinted in the Koran that Prophets were liable to have their revelations interpolated by the devil; and the word used in this place, where God is said to *revise* this text, is used in the above division, where its participle has been rendered "distinct."

In any case this text is a justification for comment; for where, as is frequently the case, the obvious sense of the passages involves difficulties, the student ought to know which of the two or more is to be the permanent authority. The differences between Islamic sects to some extent arise from different views on this matter; if, *e.g.*, the Koran is determinist, texts which seem to favour free will have to be explained in the light of the others; if it be in favour of the freedom of the will, the others must be explained away. The same holds good of the principle of religious toleration and of others.

Sources of the Koran.—The source of the Koran in the orthodox opinion is, as we have seen, Divine revelation; the only way in which the question could be put from this point of view is, To what extent do the contents of the book correspond with other known pre-existing literature? In the first place it claims to confirm the Law and the Gospel, or in general "what was before it." In the main this is the fact. The story of Joseph, that of the Fall, that of the Deliverance from Egypt, are told much as the Old Testament tells them; in several cases the matter of the Koran is nearer that of apocryphal books and collections of traditions than the Bible. The persons who figure most in the Koran are Old Testament characters. Among New Testament persons only Zacharias, John (Yahya), Mary, and Jesus ('Isā) figure. The apostles are just mentioned by their Abyssinian name, but none of them is specified. Some prophets have been identified with Old Testament characters though their names differ considerably; others belong clearly to Arabian narratives, and their sphere of work is located in Arabia. One of these, Lukman, was said to be the author of a Book of Wisdom, in the hands of some of the Arabian tribes before the Prophet's time.

The verses ascribed to a contemporary poet, Umayyah, son of Abu' l-Salt, show a considerable likeness to certain parts of the Koran,

and those who believe them to be genuine regard them as one of the sources of the Koran, especially as the Prophet, who by no means favoured poetry, is said to have admired this bard. It seems far more likely that the Koran is the source of the verses than that the converse could be the case.

The Koran is therefore cast in a different mould from those sacred books which treat directly of historical matters, whether as a record of God's dealings with a chosen people or as an authentic chronicle of the Founder's life. So far as the Koran introduces history, it is with the view of enforcing morals; this is the case even with its allusions to current events. "Ye have had a warning in two parties that met"—this introduces a brief notice of the Battle of Badr; the text does not set itself to tell the story, but reminds the hearer of the events in order to enforce the warning.

CHAPTER III

THE ISLAMIC STATE

Although we are apt to think of Islam as a religion, it is probable that the Prophet thought of it rather as a nation. "Let there be in you a nation summoning unto the good" is a divine order in the Koran. The Arabic word for "sect," used of Islam, is adopted by the Turks in the sense "nation," and this seems a justifiable mistake: for in the new community all tribal differences were to be sunk, and the theory of the Platonic Republic, according to which the members of the community should share pains and pleasures to the same extent as the members of one body, is attributed to the Prophet. And in spite of dissensions and civil wars, some length of time elapsed before the Moslem conscience countenanced any such division of nationalities as we have seen to be characteristic of the Islam of our time; and the spread of one language over the whole of the conquered territory was carried out with greater success and determination than the Romans ever achieved or displayed. For at

one time the Arabic language dominated the whole Islamic area from Spain and North Africa to Central Asia; it tolerated no rival language as Latin tolerated Greek. The converts all adopted names of the Islamic pattern, and, like Arabs, called themselves after their sons real or ideal. In Persia, with its ancient and glorious traditions, the sense of a nationality distinct from the Islamic awoke, but not till the fourth century of Islam did it even there display much vigour.

If the original purpose of the Founder may be divined, it would seem that his legislation followed an end similar to that ascribed to Lycurgus, viz. to create a *military state*. Wars are won in the first place by science, but in the second by discipline, in the third by enthusiasm. Military science is a recent invention; it is clear, however, that the Prophet gladly availed himself of such technical knowledge of the subject as was current in his time, and highly rewarded strategic talent. Science, however, in any case is the concern of the organizers and leaders, whereas the other matters are for all alike. The five daily "Prayers" constituted a drill; the fasting month a test of endurance and an education therein; enthusiasm was provoked by the magnificence of the claim to form the leading caste on earth, with a right to the possessions of all who did not belong to it, and the alternatives between spoil and Paradise. Prob-

ably, however, even more enthusiasm was inspired by the belief that the fighting was in the cause of God.

On the legislation of LYCURGUS, with its exclusively military aim, Aristotle's criticism is well known. The feature in which Mohammed's was clearly a vast improvement was that in the latter it was open to any Arab to join the dominant community and enjoy all its privileges. Towards the end of the Prophet's career the principle was introduced whereby the tolerated sects should by their labour maintain the fighting caste, enjoying protection as a compensation. After a generation or two difficulties arose because the accession of proselytes meant a loss to the exchequer, and the supporting class was no less necessary to the state than the fighting class. For a time the theory prevailed that the privileges of the fighting class were to belong to Arabs only. When the power began to be transferred to other races, it became safe to maintain the paradox that the Arabs were inferior to all other peoples.

In the main, then, the original Moslem system was to make its adherents soldier-priests, *i.e.* to combine the sacerdotal with the warrior caste. The amount of time and effort to be given daily and yearly to religious exercises rendered each Moslem a priest; no religious orders were necessary. On the other hand, every Moslem was to be always in readiness for

the sacred war; soldiering was not a career, but a life. Here, also, there were no orders, commissions being given for the particular occasion by the sovereign.

Necessity, in time, caused the Moslem empires to substitute the organized army for the horde; and though it never developed any institution quite similar to that of clergy, or ministers of religion, the growth of learning led to something comparable arising. When a mosque has been erected, public worship must in some way be organized; there must be officials whose duty it is to lead prayer or to preach, and in their selection preference will naturally be given to the best qualified. A career is thus opened out to those who possess these qualifications, and those whose tastes lie in these directions will take pains to acquire them. These need not, indeed, form a man's sole occupation, just as in some Christian communities the minister of religion may also be a gunmaker, blacksmith, or shoemaker. The natural tendency towards division of labour in the wealthier communities forms these persons into a class.

No less obvious is the need for authorities on the law, when the community has emerged from the simpler stages; and since in the Eastern religions law and theology are one, there is a need for theologians. These are the persons whom strangers usually think of as priests; yet they claim no mystic powers,

only that right to speak which is based on superior knowledge. For them of course some definite authorization, or, as we might say, ordination, is required. Usually it takes a form similar to our university degree; but the chief thing is to be able to name the authorities under whom one has studied.

But besides these persons who follow religion as a profession there is a class with which the Prophet had in his time to reckon, of those who follow it out of love.

The person who undertakes the religious life undertakes, then, nothing that is not part of the ordinary Moslem's duty and profession. Marriage is sometimes called the Prophet's institution, and the view taken by Moslem authorities on the subject of it is absolutely at variance with that of the Mediæval Church, and of a considerable portion of Christendom still. Numerous marriages are thought to constitute a part of the life of the ascetic. It is not clear that the ascetic or devotee is expected to abstain from anything which is lawful to a Moslem. Perhaps, however, "perpetual fasting," a phrase interpreted in different ways, yet indicating prolonged abstinence from food, is considered to be specially meritorious; yet this process is not necessarily associated with membership of any order.

The equality of all Moslems was, we have every reason to believe, a fundamental doctrine with the Prophet, and the earliest inter-

preters of his ideas were probably right in thinking that he intended that rule to be absolutely without exceptions, even his own family enjoying no privileges. His own position was, of course, exceptional; but, though it is not for us to take a side in a purely Islamic controversy, he would seem to have regarded the ideal brotherhood of Islam as superior in closeness to all family ties. He established no hierarchy of officials; at most some few of his followers received titles of honour which belonged exclusively to themselves. He made no permanent appointments; the officials created by him were purely for the occasion, and when that was over the office as well as the appointment lapsed. How an army could be made effective without a system of officers is perhaps no easy question; apparently when his armies became vast, the old tribal organization, such as it was, was maintained.

As the years rolled on, and as province after province was added to Islamic territory, certain innovations were introduced. A distinction arose between Arabs and others; and until the end of the Umayyad period the "clients," or non-Arabian converts, suffered from some of the disabilities of the unconverted, even the poll-tax being often exacted from them, certainly against the intentions of the Founder of the system. With the rise of the Abbasid Dynasty this abuse came to an end. On the other hand, by that time an

Islamic nobility had arisen. The chief place therein was occupied by the two great families which claimed connexion with the Prophet—the descendants of his daughter Fatimah and his uncle Abbas. In the fourth century of Islam each of these families had its Registrars, persons whose duty it was to keep a record of the births and deaths in these noble families, especially in the great cities; and this office is not yet obsolete. Their task was a formidable one; and although the history of these families had from the first had political importance, it proved too heavy for those to whom it was entrusted; whence when a Fatimide monarch ascended the throne of a new Caliphate in Egypt, there were various accounts of the branch to which he belonged, and books were written to disprove his title. A lower rank of nobility was formed by the descendants of the most eminent of the Followers or Companions of the Prophet, and even the second Caliph, in his Instructions to a Judge (if the document be genuine), notices the distinction between the noble and ignoble.

So far as the family of Fatimah went, the privilege afforded by this sort of nobility was often doubtful. The claim to the throne, which they never abandoned, led to their being constantly persecuted, and there is many a treatise on the sufferings of the Prophet's descendants. During the Umayyad period it was unsafe, we are told, to name

a child after any one of them; under the Umayyads the two families made common cause, but when the usurpers had been overthrown, the Abbasids reaped all the benefit; the blood of the Prophet's offspring began again to flow.

The green turban, which is the external badge of this nobility, dates from an ordinance of the Egyptian Sultan in 1371.

Even when the system of government became highly organized, as was the case in both the Eastern and the Western Caliphates, the institution of hereditary titles did not develop. If there was anywhere a caste system, it was racial, *i.e.* the conquering power arrogated to itself all the offices of state. Thus when Egypt was governed by Mamluke sovereigns, the royal bodyguard, consisting mainly of Circassians and Turks, formed a ruling caste; and Napoleon, when he invaded Egypt, professed indignation at the Mamlukes assuming to themselves rights over all the other inhabitants of the country, which of course at that time was, at least nominally, a possession of the Turks.

The rest of free mankind were in the Prophet's time two classes: members of recognized religions, and members of religions which were not be to recognized. His principle was to tolerate Jews and Christians in Arabia, but to exterminate paganism; it is likely that he would have extended this

toleration to Magianism and Sabaism. The principle of his second successor, the legislator Omar, was to tolerate in the Arabian peninsula Islam only; elsewhere to adopt the principle of tolerated and tributary cults. The north-western world was of course largely Christianized when Islam became powerful; on the other hand, in Africa and Asia, especially India, paganism of various sorts was still dominant. The earliest Moslem invaders of India waged fierce war against Hinduism, and overthrew many temples; but when India was permanently colonized by Moslems, this spirit was very greatly mollified, and though forcible conversions, even on a large scale, were not unknown, in the main Islam consented to the neighbourhood of idolaters.

The condition of these tolerated cults demands a few moments' attention. To the Jews outside Arabia, the Moslem conquest was probably an unmixed blessing. The mediæval Christian regarded the Jew as responsible for the Crucifixion, and the condition of the Jews in such Christian states as tolerated them at all was deplorable; that the Church on the whole endeavoured to protect them is probably true. The Moslem, who did not believe in the Crucifixion having taken place, had not this injury to avenge; nor would he have regarded it as his business to avenge it. Whereas, then, in Christian countries occupied by Moslems Christianity

was degraded, the conquest of Islam elevated Judaism, and practically the whole of Jewish literature is modelled on that which was developed in Islamic states. Incapacity to bear arms, which is the main disability inflicted by Islam on the subject cults, was the Jew's already; his religion in any case prevented him from fighting effectively, as the Greeks had long ago told him. The possibility of maintaining his religious ceremonies in their full splendour had ceased since the fall of Jerusalem, whence he had nothing to regret on that score. On the other hand, in many essentials, especially the tabooing of images and of swine's flesh, and the practice of circumcision, the new religion was far nearer Judaism than Christianity. Further, the place claimed by Mohammed's followers for him was wholly different from that which the Christians assigned to the Founder of their faith. The differences between Islam and Judaism are trivial, those between Christianity and the other systems vital. Hence outside Arabia the triumph of the new system meant for Judaism a new lease of life.

To the Christians, on the other hand, the change meant in some places security from sectarian persecution, which of course was at times as fierce as man or demon could inflict; but it everywhere meant a loss of caste, transference from equality of a kind to inferiority. Theoretically the system of Mo-

hammed provided a *quid pro quo* for the poll-tax in relief from military service. But this *quid pro quo* also meant defencelessness; and when either a fanatic filled the throne, or the government produced discontent among the Moslems, the position of the Christians became intolerable. In all Moslem countries their numbers had a tendency to dwindle, there being many temptations to join the ruling community, even when this was not enforced under pain of death; in Egypt and Syria those that remained lost their languages and adopted that of the conqueror; those who, like the Nestorians, retained both language and nationality through the centuries afford little ground for admiration besides their steadfastness. Yet a state within the state has certain privileges; and had the interests of all the protected cults been solid, the history of Islamic countries would have been very different. Even in spite of their conflicting interests, the Moslem rulers in general paid them the same sort of compliment that the Romans paid the Greeks, viz. a profound belief in their superior intelligence and ability except in actual warfare. Professions and industries requiring intellectual ability drifted into their hands; the court physician was regularly a Jew or a Christian, and even the Secretary of State was often chosen from their ranks. Any place in the state, except that of head of it or leadership

of the army, could be theirs. The Moslems of both Caliphates were constantly scandalized by the bureaux being filled with Christian, Jewish, or even Sabian and Magian officials; their prejudices were gratified by the enforcement of the repressive legislation of Omar; after a few months, these enactments would fall into desuetude and the bureaux begin to be filled as before. The awakening of Europe, which dates from the invention of printing and the consequent Reformation, did not seriously affect this matter. If in our time before the Ottoman revolution the most important posts in the empire were at times filled by Armenians, parallels to this could be cited from the third and subsequent centuries of Islam.

The orthodox doctrine which forbade the Moslems to have non-Moslem allies in their wars, and therefore rendered the disarmament of the tolerated cults necessary, yielded less to the logic of facts than many other Islamic institutions, yet even it did not escape. In the dissensions between the rival Caliphates and the Byzantines, Christian and Moslem troops occasionally were found fighting together against Moslems, and the initial success of the Crusades was due to the favour shown the Christian invaders of Palestine by the Egyptian Moslems. The history of Spain and North Africa furnishes other examples of exceptions.

In Moslem countries conquered by Christian powers the Islamic caste-system has in the main been abolished; and professedly Christian statesmen only win contempt from Moslems and resentment from the native Christians by encouraging it. It has been the wisdom of the enlightened constitutional Government of Turkey to compel the Jews and Christians to do military service; and this reform is likely to have a far-reaching and beneficent effect. Yet it must be observed that the notion that all the subjects of the same sovereign should enjoy the same rights was propounded in the Ottoman empire as early as the seventeenth century by the Köprülü family, which furnished some eminent ministers of state; and that the Christian powers of Europe amid all their conflicting interests and intrigues steadily pursued the object of winning equal rights for all the subjects of the Ottoman Empire for the greater part of the nineteenth century.

Besides these castes there existed a third, taken over unchanged from the ancient world, that of *slaves*. How the doctrine of the equality of all Moslems was to be reconciled with this institution was not obvious; for it might seem that a slave had merely to adopt Islam in order *ipso facto* to become free; and indeed the doctrine that no one already a Moslem may be enslaved seems to be orthodox. Omar is said to have advanced the

theory that no *Arab* might be enslaved, and in the main these living chattels came from other races. The Koranic legislation encouraged their manumission; many an offence could be expiated in this way. On the other hand, it by no means discouraged their capture or the trade in them; and such slave-trade as remains after the repression of it by European powers, and the abolition of it in the Ottoman Empire, is in the hands of Arabs. The subject is wide and takes us to unsavoury topics, but some of the peculiarities of Islam in this matter may be mentioned. A slave-girl is her master's legal concubine; and by maternity she acquires the right of unsaleability, while her children are free and in no way inferior to the children of the freewoman. This is a deduction from the story of Hagar and Ishmael. In general this excellent rule is apparently observed; but Miss MACNAB states that in Morocco it is no uncommon thing for the master to sell both mother and child. On the other hand, the practice of manumitting such concubines and then marrying them, is a subject of constant allusion in Moslem literature, both ancient and modern. The practice of emasculation is attributed by the Moslems to the Byzantines, whom the eunuchs were said to detest mortally in consequence. There can be little doubt that it is against the spirit of the Koran; yet the practice of polygamy rendered it almost in-

dispensable. Hence these creatures were to be seen in numbers till recently in Islamic countries, and have not perhaps even yet wholly disappeared.

But what is rather more remarkable is that in Islam very little degradation is attached to the condition of slaves. Slave dynasties ruled for considerable periods in both Egypt and India; slavery was in the former country almost a necessary preliminary to advancement, and we do not find that the origin of their sovereigns was felt as a disgrace by their subjects. Servile wars such as we read about in classical history seem to have been wholly unknown.

According to the Sayyid RASHID the abolition of slavery was the object of the Prophet, but he meant it to be done by degrees, so as to avoid the evils which have sometimes been experienced—for instance, in the United States—by the sudden execution of so sweeping a reform. The evidence for this proposition is to be found in a number of traditions which indicate that a slave was to acquire freedom by even a mild form of punishment, and that the Divine Being threatened reprisals on the master for any abuse whatever of his power. If, therefore, the guidance of the Pious Caliphs had been followed, the propagation of Islam would have brought with it the abolition of slavery. Very clearly that guidance was not followed, since it may be doubted whether any

Moslem philosopher or lawyer ever contemplated its abolition before Europe practically enforced it, and the countries in which it still thrives are those Moslem lands which have least felt European influence—Arabia and Morocco. The slave-market of Marrakish (Morocco) is described after a recent visit by an acute observer, Miss FRANCES MACNAB, in 1902; the slaves were prisoners made in the internecine wars of the Sudanese tribes, and the purchasers were chiefly Arabs from Arabia; the proceedings were opened with prayer. "The lot of slaves is a terrible one, and slavery still exists" in Bokhara, says E. G. KEMP, who visited this place, where slavery is nominally suppressed, in 1910. "Persia," says Miss ELLA SYKES, also writing in 1910, "is the Paradise of slaves. Though their owners have power of life and death over them [?], Persians say that as slaves are costly to buy, they must be well treated and given no hard work to do; moreover, as they have no home of their own, their interest is sure to be centred in that of their adoption, therefore they can be trusted far more than any servant. Owing to the vigorous way in which Great Britain has put down the slave trade in the Persian Gulf, negroes and negresses are expensive, though many are still introduced by the pilgrims from Meccah. They often get considerable wealth if in the household of a man of position, but hardly

ever wish to purchase their freedom." K. LENZ, a writer who is hostile to Islam, attested the same of the slaves of Morocco in 1892; the slave in Morocco is, according to him, a domestic servant, well kept and treated, who not infrequently holds an influential position in the establishment. The lot of the "white slaves in Europe" (whoever they may be) is a far worse and sadder one. Similarly Baron NOLDE (in 1895) asserted that the slave in Arabia is regarded and treated as a spoiled child.

The abolition of slavery in any Moslem state is fairly recent. In the Ottoman Empire it was abolished by the Constitution of 1876; there is no doubt that it survived long after, especially in Arabia, but the trade grows every year more difficult. It is to the credit of the Khedive Ismail (1863—1882) that he employed two English officers, Sir SAMUEL BAKER and Colonel (afterwards General) GORDON, to suppress the slave trade in the Sudan, with which the name of Zubair Pasha especially had been connected. Since the British occupation of Egypt any slave can obtain his freedom by demanding it. In the Sudan the slave question is, according to ARTIN PASHA, the constant preoccupation of every one, but the Sirdar (as we may easily believe) has evolved a plan which will speedily bring to a solution this vitally interesting problem. The plan which the PASHA after-

wards describes is that whereby runaway slaves after manumission are induced to re-enter the service of their former owners at a fixed rate of wages, and this would appear to bridge over the gulf between servitude and free labour; yet we are authoritatively told that in East Africa the dislike of the masters to paying wages has caused the agricultural industry to suffer by the abolition of the trade. In Afghanistan slavery was abolished in 1895 through British influence; in 1897 it was through the same power abolished in Zanzibar, which had been a notorious slave-market. The same has nominally happened in Khiva and Bokhara in accordance with the terms of a treaty with Russia. Few books of travel now make any allusion to the subject; the works which deal with the regeneration of Turkey for the most part overlook it. From the modern Turkish romances one would guess that it was obsolete.

We should have expected the practice of manumission to have brought about the existence of an intermediate caste between the free and the slaves, viz. the freedmen, and to a certain extent this has happened; the code assigns these persons certain rights and duties which belong to neither of the other castes.

The Political System.—Mohammed ruled his community as divine commissioner; naturally the members of it claimed no rights of self-government against Almighty God, and

considered it a high privilege that they had a ready means of ascertaining the divine will. What arrangement he would have made for the future administration of his empire is unknown; the title actually taken by his successors was "substitute," "deputy" (Caliph), which comes from a text of the Koran where Adam is said to be God's deputy on earth; it has variously been interpreted as vicar of God, of Mohammed, and of the last "vicar." The question of its exact import is of little importance; the word for "sovereign," which is synonymous with it, means literally "leader in prayer." When Mohammed delegated that duty to Abu Bakr, it was regarded as an indication that the latter was to succeed to the general leadership. The principle of autocratic government may be said to have remained unquestioned in Islamic states until the nineteenth century, when the wave set in motion by the French Revolution reached Turkey in Europe and then Asia; but it has scarcely found its way seriously into the Heat-Belt, and its appropriateness to the Heat-Belt may be questioned, since the demand for widespread intellectual activity which constitutional government makes cannot easily be met. It is true that texts are now cited from the Koran showing that what Islam contemplated was democracy; but this seems to be due to confusion between advisory councils and legislative or

administrative councils. That the sovereign does well to take advice is the doctrine not only of the Koran, but of all the political philosophy of the East; failure after deliberation is even said to be a better thing than success without it. But this is a wholly different matter from giving the council power to choose and issue orders; and that the introduction of this principle is wholly modern is shown by the fact that the words for "vote," "majority," "ballot," are recent introductions into the Islamic languages. Omar (called by SPRENGER "the greatest statesman of all time") was so little familiar with the theory of settling by majorities that he appointed a committee of *six*, and ordered that in the event of four taking one side and two the other, the minority should be decapitated. His committee, it would seem (not unnaturally), declined to act; and it is obvious that a few divisions on this principle would reduce even our House of Commons to one.

Hence Islam had till the nineteenth century no constitutional lawyers; and the works which are said to deal with constitutional law in the main consist of definitions whereby the functions of various state officials are circumscribed.

Nevertheless, the question who had the right to be sovereign could not be left unanswered. The natural reply would be "the Prophet's heir"; but this was controverted

by a theory that Prophets left no heirs. So long as this latter view prevailed, the possible answers to the question were "the person appointed by the last sovereign," and "the person on whom the Moslems are agreed." The first of these might have been workable had the Roman principle of adoption been admitted; but adoption had been abolished by the Prophet, who is even said to have married the divorced wife of a son adopted by himself in pagan times, in order to prove its abolition. The latter principle could only work as a legal fiction; *i.e.* when a general had compelled obedience by force of arms, his candidate would perforce have the approval of all the Moslems.

This in the main was how the Caliphate was secured by the founder of the first hereditary dynasty, the Umayyads; with them the hereditary principle was introduced into the Islamic sovereignty, though it soon became clear that if some one's heir was heir to the Prophet's throne, it ought to be the Prophet's heir. But here the fresh difficulty arose that the Prophet's line was continued not through a son, but through a daughter. The Prophet had no brother; on the other hand, he had uncles on the father's side, and one of these, Abbas, appears to have been the head of the family during the Prophet's later life, and to have died a Believer. When, therefore, the Umayyad usurpers had been

overthrown, this difficulty came to the front, and it has divided the Islamic world ever since.

Those who endeavoured to settle the whole question by precedents arrived at the conclusion that the sovereign ought to be a member of the Prophet's tribe, Kuraish; this formula would embrace all those who held the nominal sovereignty until Ottoman times.

Yet another difficulty was to be found in the question of character; since Islam was a religion as well as a state, to what extent did the sovereign forfeit his office by misconduct? And if he did, whose business was it to dethrone him? The former question was usually answered in the affirmative, and it is recorded that a sovereign at times invited his subjects to dethrone him if he should fail to give them satisfaction. But to the second question no intelligible reply could be given, since there was no organized body on whom such a duty could fall. It could only be done by conspiracy, as in the case of the third Caliph: a dangerous principle to introduce into the state. The theory, however, that a sovereign could forfeit his office by misconduct served as a convenient legal fiction whereby conquerors could put their creatures on the throne.

One other qualification for the sovereignty besides moral competence was physical com-

petence; a matter which could be determined far more easily than the other. Since blindness was a disqualification, it became the practice to blind deposed sovereigns, whose claims were thereby annulled.

However, then, it might be determined who should be sovereign, the Moslem subjects had no rights against the actual head of the community. The individual who is summoned to execution is told to "answer the Commander of the Faithful"; unless by any chance he be strong enough to resist, he can make no appeal to anything but the sovereign's mercy; the sovereign is responsible to no one for the execution, and the minister is responsible to the sovereign only.

Without going to Aristotle, the Caliphs discovered that power of this sort could more easily be maintained by a foreign bodyguard than by reliance on the loyalty of their countrymen. By the middle of the third century of Islam, the foreign bodyguard became an institution of the Caliphate, quickly leading to the transference of the real power from the Caliph to the captain of the guard. His authority, however, rested on no moral basis, and Islamic history becomes from that time largely a struggle between condottieri. Revolutions in the sense of changes of the form of Government never occurred till European ideas had circulated in Islamic countries; no rights or safeguards for personal liberty—

nothing, in short, for which European parties have contended—was ever demanded or won. Where men fought for ideas, as they sometimes did, the ideas never took the form of modification to be applied to the constitution; it was only to substitute one ruler for another. This is why Oriental history is so dreary and uninstructive.

Constitutional history, then, so far as it exists, is confined to the origin and decline of offices, or rather their names. The Prophet's plan was so far as possible to leave the older system of government unaltered; he had, however, to send officials to collect the property-tax called Alms, and to instruct new converts in the Koran. The vast extension of Islam which took place under the second Caliph rendered the need for an administrative system pressing: the tax-collector became the provincial governor, and with him a judge was associated for the settlement of civil suits; criminal suits came under the governor's jurisdiction. These two officials in theory received stipends from the Government. At times the judge preferred supporting himself by some industry; normally it was the business of the governor to collect the revenue, much of which was farmed, and after spending what was requisite on the province, and drawing his own stipend, to forward the surplus to the capital. Occasionally as a special favour a provincial governor

was allowed to retain the surplus for his own use; and as province after province detached itself from the Caliphate, the contribution sent to the metropolis became more and more occasional and nominal.

Permanent delegation of duties was not, as we have seen, the practice of the Prophet, and he maintained no definite secretaries of state, though many of his literate helpers were at different times charged with the composition of letters or the taking down of revelations. The vizier, or prime minister, first meets us in the Abbasid period; besides being the sovereign's chief adviser, he was also his commander-in-chief and chief justice. But the progress of Islam had led in early times to the institution of bureaux, modelled, it is said, on Persian precedents; in these bureaux administrative systems developed, leading to a hierarchy of permanent officials. A man entered the office as writer, and might in time rise to be grand vizier.

The cabinet, with assignation of portfolios, such as is now found in reformed Islamic states, is borrowed from European systems.

Some of the titles assumed by Islamic monarchs may be collected here. The sovereign of undivided Islam is known as either the Caliph (*Khalīfah*), *i.e.* substitution, or substitute for God on earth, etc.; or as the *Imām*, *i.e.* exemplar, or leader in prayer; or the *Amīr*, *i.e.* person put in

authority over the Believers (*i.e.* the Moslems). The title *Amīr* of the Moslems has been held by some African potentates. The name *Sultān*, like "magistrate" and *podestà*, originally abstract, *i.e.* "power," seems to have been adopted in the fourth century of Islam by those military chiefs who assumed the direction of affairs in the metropolis, Baghdad, while acknowledging the spiritual headship of the Prophet's heir. When the seat of the Abbasid Caliphate was transferred from Baghdad to Cairo, the Caliph's authority was far more shadowy than it had ever been in Baghdad; still it was the policy of the actual rulers to maintain such an official, whose sole duty was to delegate his supposed powers to themselves, and the title which they reserved for themselves was Sultan. The Arabic *malik*, an ancient word for "king," has rarely, if ever, had any titular meaning among Islamic peoples; in quite early times we find it applied to the ministers as well as to the sovereign. The Persian *Shāh* ("king") or *Pādishāh* ("lord king") came into use when nearly independent dynasties were founded in Persia in the fourth century of Islam; the former is usually applied to the sovereign of Persia, the latter to the Sultan of Turkey. To the latter the Turkish name Khākān may also be applied. The title *Khān* is in Turkey applied to the Sultan, and regularly follows his name; in Persia it indicates not sover-

eignty, but nobility (corresponding with the Turkish *pāshā*); it is also the title borne by the prince of Bokhara. *Khedive*, a Persian name for "sovereign," was bestowed by the Sultan of Turkey on Ismail Pasha, ruler of Egypt. *Nizām*, the title of the ruler of Hyderabad, is an abridgment of Nizām al-mulk "order of the realm." The title Imām, the origin of which we have seen, was adopted by the rulers of Oman in accordance with their particular doctrines, according to which the sovereignty was inherent in no particular line; but since 1804 they appear to have abandoned it for the simpler *Sayyid*, literally "lord," and in most Islamic countries given as a courtesy title to the descendants of the Prophet. The title *Dey*, which was held by the ruler of Algiers before the French conquest, means literally "maternal uncle"; it was the title of the chief of the Janissaries, who usually became governor on a vacancy occurring.

Criminal Law.—It has been the tendency of European jurisprudence to assign penalties such as death, imprisonment, or fine, to cases in which the offender injures either the community as a whole or some other individual; where such injury is not obvious, an act may earn infamy, but is not otherwise punished. The notion of infamy is not strange to Islam, for it means disqualification from giving evidence or attesting deeds; but it would seem

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
SANDFORD FLEMING LIBRARY

that in no case is this regarded as a sufficient penalty for an offence. For many offences against religion or morals, the law assigns a fixed penalty, whether death, mutilation, or stripes; other forms of punishment are exile, imprisonment, and fines. The caste distinction which has been noticed is of some importance in the former cases; the penalty to be exacted is less when the injured party is a Christian or a slave than when a Moslem. The theory that murder was an offence against either the community or the moral law seems to have made very little way by the introduction of Islam; it was an injury to the family which thereby lost a member: that family had the right to demand a life in exchange, but commutation was recommended; in any case more than one life might not be demanded. Where a man was found guilty of the murder of an unknown man, apparently a long term of imprisonment was the normal punishment.

European science and democracy have, without yet solving the problem of punishment, nevertheless deprived it of all barbarity and vindictiveness; the Ottoman Empire, here as elsewhere most amenable to European influence, has by adapting the Code Napoléon advanced in the same direction. Two Islamic doctrines may be noticed on the subject of punishment. One is that punishment with fire is a privilege wherein God allows no one

else to share; another that according to the Prophet mutilation is unlawful even in the case of a mad dog. Some tyrants gratified their vengeance by burning those who displeased them; but on the whole, Islam in this matter could have given a lesson to the Church of Rome, which as late as 1900 lent its authority to the doctrine that heretics should be burned. In the matter of torture and mutilation the Moslems were no less ingenious than others. D. Fraser in a book published this year gives a photograph of a brigand buried alive by order of a governor of Ispahan; the present writer had an interview with another Persian governor in 1901, who was said to have cut a prisoner to pieces, and a photograph is said to have been taken of the same process in the market-place of a Persian city. In independent Moslem states such practices were common; to our sensitive minds the perusal of most chronicles in Moslem languages is in consequence harrowing. Hand-cutting, which is the legal punishment for theft, can scarcely be regarded as other than mutilation, and it is strange that the Prophet should have maintained it. That this still exists in Persia is attested by travellers: "such horrible punishments," says Miss Ella Sykes (in 1910), "as being plastered up alive, being crucified or blown from a cannon, are practically punishments of the past; but a petty thief is still liable to

have his hand severed, and thus be relegated to the miserable lot of a beggar."

The punishment assigned by law for abandoning Islam is death. In 1844 this punishment was actually carried out in the case of a Greek who was an Ottoman subject, and Lord Stratford de Redcliffe urged the abolition of this barbarous rule. What was obtained finally in Turkey, according to ENGELHARDT, was not the abrogation of a divine law, but an undertaking on the part of the Porte that no member of any religious community should be molested on account of his religion. As late as 1892 it was thought that any Persian proselyte to Christianity would be sentenced to death, and in 1901 the writer was told that Moslems in that country desiring to be baptized were sent to Bombay by the missionaries for fear of what might occur; and he once had to translate a document from Morocco containing the condemnation to death of a Jew who, having early in youth been made to embrace Islam, wished to rejoin the community of his fathers.

We occasionally hear of an official called censor whose business it was to look after public morality. How far much attention was paid to the matter depended on the tastes of the particular sovereign who happened to be reigning. From the works whence we get the most vivid pictures of Mohammedan states, it would appear that few sovereigns

took a very strict view of their duties in this matter. The general insecurity of life and property which has characterized Moslem Government was not, however, due to imperfection in the code so much as to political instability and systematic wasting of the revenue, which was regarded as the sovereign's privy purse.

Jurisprudence.—It was the earliest theory of Islam that the new religion should interfere as little as possible with pre-existing practice: that practice might and should be followed except where the divine law forbade it or superseded it. And had Islam been confined to Arabia, as perhaps was at one time the Prophet's intention, this principle might have been maintained: it spread, however, over so many nations and countries with wholly different customs and practices, that the administration of such a society would have offered bewildering difficulty had not complete uniformity been introduced. In place, then, of the earlier doctrine there arose the maxim "Islam cancels all that was before it," and the supplement to the Koran had to be obtained from the practice not of the community, but of the Prophet. It was argued that the only evidence for the authority of the Koran was the infallibility of the Prophet; unless the Prophet could not make a mistake, he might be mistaken in ascribing certain assertions to God, and there was no

saying what those assertions might be. But if he was infallible, then his words and conduct were no less certain a guide to his followers than the divine revelation itself, and the tabulation and perpetuation of the one were as necessary as those of the other. As this theory came to be adopted, men strained their memories to recollect his utterances and actions, however trivial the occasion, however little premeditated. When cases came before judges their endeavour was to discover whether anything of the sort had ever come before the Prophet, or whether he had ever made a statement which threw light upon it. The aim of the devotee was to reproduce the Prophet in every gesture, every manifestation of the will. And we may well believe that those who had come in contact with that remarkable figure would have his words and actions ineffaceably impressed on their memories.

In the second place, where a religion is in part historical, the biographical element forms an essential part of it. The Moslem creed is, There is no god but Allah, and Mohammed is the Apostle of Allah. This formula only begins to have a meaning when it is explained who Mohammed is or was. Some location of the man in space and time is therefore a necessity. Just, then, as in the case of the Founder of Christianity it is clear that so soon as missionary work began on a great

scale a dogmatic biography had to be drawn up and communicated to proselytes, so with Islam those who were called upon to accept it had a right to demand some information about Mohammed. It does not appear that this biography was committed to writing till after the founding of Baghdad (732), when the introduction of paper started literary enterprise on a large scale. But there is good reason for supposing that it had assumed definite shape before long. There was no doubt about the main incidents of the Prophet's life or about their order. Islam knew from the history of the Jews that facts are only worth chronicling when they are worth remembering: for the period of Jewish independence there are chronicles; for other periods there are none. The empire founded by the Prophet gave Arabian history value, and an attempt was made to rescue it from oblivion. In the time that followed his rise this could be done, and the chronicles are remarkably complete and accurate. For the time preceding nothing but vague legends could be collected. The temptation, however, to add details or narratives from the imagination where the memory did not supply them was too great to resist. The distinction between the actually certain and the morally certain is not to be realized save by minds that are either gifted or highly trained. Men stated what in their opinion ought to

have been done or uttered as though it had really been done or uttered. Often this was unconscious, but at times doubtless it was conscious. Many such fictions were rendered necessary by the theory of law. If the Prophet's practice was the sole source of law, save where the Koran provided a rule, some practice had to be ascribed to the Prophet.

The legal profession in consequence started almost immediately after the settling of Arabia, and there were persons in Medinah who made it their mission to collect the Prophet's rulings, and even arranged them under heads for ease of reference. It seems likely that the prevalent theory was that nothing of this sort should be permanently written : if put down at all, it might only be as a temporary aid to the memory. The existence among the Jews also of an unwritten code or " oral law " side by side with the written law, doubtless encouraged the rise of this profession, for the Jewish doctor also was a man who had been orally instructed in traditions—views held by Rabbis about conduct and practice.

The codification of law therefore depended on the accumulation of authentic traditions : and the number both of sources and of reporters soon produced almost incredible confusion. Any person who had ever associated with the Prophet might conceivably be a

source of law: provided of course that he had been at the time old enough to observe and remember. Similarly any one who had associated with one of these might be a source in the second degree on the same condition. But though the possibility of their having heard or seen what they professed might be ascertained, their credibility had also to be ascertained, and of this the criterion might be variable. Thus Omar held that any Moslem who was not a notorious evil liver should be believed.

It was not until the third century of Islam that the criticism of tradition came into vogue, perhaps as serious an innovation as the "higher criticism" was in our day. The number of traditions then in circulation was vast; and as these were used to settle questions of morals, legal rights, and theology, it was of importance that the Islamic world should know where they stood. The task of sorting traditions, distinguishing the genuine from the fictitious, or arranging them in order of credibility, was undertaken, naturally, by many persons at the same time. The result was "the six Books" or canonical collections of tradition, though the number and order of precedence varied somewhat in different regions. No doubt, however, existed as to the book which should take the first place in the list. The *Sahih* of Bokhari holds it with certainty, and has acquired a degree of

sanctity before which in places that of the Koran pales.

Just as in our day the German student migrates from university to university, so the traditionalist in order to acquire learning had to travel to and fro. The theory that tradition was to be communicated orally outlived its written compilation by many centuries; and even if Bokhari's work had succeeded in suppressing the unauthentic traditions, the credibility postulated for those who communicated or handed down his collection would have rendered their personal teaching indispensable; but there was a question of "conditions," *i.e.* tests of the authenticity of traditions, and for some Bokhari was too strict. Moreover, Bokhari's method was to furnish a series of rules with the precedents for them; his collection does not therefore profess to be wholly objective and free from conscious intention.

The series of efforts which culminated in the works of Bokhari and others, represents a form of historical research to which few countries furnish a parallel. To some extent it dominated the historical writing of the Arabs, until the accumulations of matter were too vast to admit of its constant employment. The principle is to tell the story in the words of the eye-witness; the historian and his immediate sources, where he is not dealing with contemporary history, are all

intermediaries. If there were several eye-witnesses, all deserving of credit, then the historian produces their statements side by side, occasionally abridging where their accounts are identical. The criticism of tradition, then, means estimating the value of authorities, omitting those who are known to be untrustworthy, and perhaps arranging the others in some order of trustworthiness.

The results of these endeavours have not to us the value which they had for the Moslem world, but they are of considerable value nevertheless. There was a motive provided for raking up details about the personages whose names figured in the chains of tradition; and in the case of many a tradition, though we may not believe it to be authentic, we can give a good account of the reason why, and the time when, it was fabricated.

The collecting of these traditions and arranging them under heads began, as we have seen, some time before the critical work conducted in the third century. There is no doubt that in jurisprudence as in other matters the Moslems were not unwilling to accept guidance from experts belonging to other communities; and the terminology of Islamic law shows traces of the employment of Jewish advisers, as well as of persons versed in the Byzantine Code.

The fundamental difference between Islamic jurisprudence and European juris-

prudence must not be forgotten, and it obviously arises from the physical conditions within and outside the Heat-Belt. The latter is an experimental science, entailing the labour of registering cases and tabulating results, of appointing commissions of men carefully selected and trained, of endless correction and amelioration. The former regards legislation as absolutely beyond man's capacity: all his business is to know and administer a set of rules revealed by God.

"We must obey God rather than men," is therefore the formula which underlies the Islamic system; and just as we saw that the Ottoman statesmen in the middle of the nineteenth century declared that abrogation of the rule which renders apostasy from Islam a capital offence was outside their competence, so, where the letter of the Koran is unambiguous, there is theoretically no power on earth which can repeal it. On the other hand, the chance of repeal by the coming of another Prophet is taken away by the doctrine which makes Mohammed the ultimate channel of revelation. Attempts which have been made at dealing with this difficulty have taken the form of extreme licence in interpretation, going so far as "mutilating the word of God," or of suggesting that although there are to be no more Prophets, yet the line of Saints is not extinct, and making their function supersede that of the Prophet. Both these

methods are wholly unsatisfactory, for the traditional interpretation cannot easily be displaced in favour of one that is unnatural, and the second method opens the door to charlatanism; since if the law has to be altered, it should obviously be done by an acknowledged authority, such as the head of the State.

The theory that parts of the Koran abrogate other parts can to a certain extent be used to get over the difficulty, but the limits within which the principle can be applied appear to be narrow, and here too there is the dffiiculty of at once adhering to and discarding the tradition.

It has been the principle of those European states which have taken Islamic territories under their protection to interfere as little as possible with the code in use, and in general in civil matters to enforce its administration; and indeed the East India Company at one time enforced the criminal law of Islam to an extent which would not now be approved. The tendency, however, is for the experimental legislation of the protecting communities to displace the Koranic legislation except in matters of ritual observance. And the prosperity and progress of Moslem communities in these countries may largely be ascribed to the fact that the need for perpetual accommodation to changing conditions with which the older system could not grapple is thus effectively supplied.

As we have seen, the Ottoman Empire, which has so often shocked orthodox opinion by its innovations, in the middle of the nineteenth century adopted a European code, thereby outraging those who recognized no legislation that was not divine; and this willingness to profit by European experience has borne noble fruit.

CHAPTER IV

ISLAMIC THEORY AND PRACTICE

THE physical test of a Moslem is *Circumcision*, a practice taken over from Pagan times, and thought to go back to Abraham or even earlier. We learn from the Book of Genesis that when that chronicle was composed it had already been noticed that Jews and Arabs differed as to the age when this operation should be performed, the former making it an initiation into life, the latter into active life. Unlike the Jews, the Moslems vary greatly as to the age of the person "to be cleansed," as their phrase runs; while some prefer the eighth day, others wait till the eleventh year or later. The operator is usually a barber. In some places a great number undergo it all together, and nearly everywhere it is an occasion for festivities. In China and Turkestan it is said to be sometimes neglected.

It is probable that this initiation into life, if it be anything more than a secret badge distinguishing at one time the members of a particular tribe or organization, is due to physical conditions connected with the

Heat-Belt. To the same we may ascribe the Islamic practice of burying immediately after death. Burial is coupled with two other things which admit of no delay—the entertainment of a guest and the marrying of a daughter. That this last is also a matter connected with climate is obvious. It may here be observed that Moslem marriage is a legal contract, which may be solemnized by a sermon, and that a religious service is held over the dead.

The oral test is the pronunciation of the formula which has been mentioned, declaring that there is no god but ALLAH, and that Mohammed is his Prophet or Messenger.

The practical test is to be found in the performance of various obligations. Some of these are incumbent on the individual, others on the community at large.

The four which are incumbent on the individual are: (*a*) *Worship*, *i.e.* the repetition of certain formulæ in Arabic, accompanied by certain postures of the body five times daily. A preliminary condition of worship is that the body should be in a state of legal purity, of which the conception is similar to that found in the Hebrew Pentateuch. Preferably it should be performed congregationally in a *Mosque*, *i.e.* "prostrating-place," which corresponds with the Jewish synagogue and the Christian church. The essential parts of a mosque are: a court, usually surrounded by cloisters, and with one or more fountains

for ablutions; a covered building, sometimes open toward the court, for prayer, and in it the *Mihrab*, a niche showing the *Kiblah*, *i.e.* the direction of Meccah—for prostration must be in the direction of that holy place. To the right of the Mihrab stands the *Minbar*, pulpit, with a high flight of stairs in front; opposite is the *Dikkah*, with the reading-desk on which the Koran stands; *Minarets*, light-houses—probably so named because the first were imitated from the celebrated lighthouse of Alexandria, but another explanation refers to the habit of illuminating them on holidays—are slender towers whence the *Muezzin*, crier, gives the five daily calls to prayer. These towers may be one, two, four, or six in number.

Mosques are not strictly limited to divine worship as are churches with us. They are often used for lecture halls or schools; in early times they were used by authors and poets for the recitation of their works. The chief instance is the Azhar in Cairo, where almost the whole space is occupied by students, while in almost any mosque one or more students may be seen on the floor with their book on a portable, often richly inlaid table. An important mosque generally has a library attached to it and a school; sometimes baths and a khan.

In Turkey the Church of St. Sophia, as great an object of admiration to the Turks

as to Christians, has served as a model for mosques, which are less simple in construction in that country than in Egypt and Persia.

The wide floor-spaces, uninterrupted by pews or chairs, are very impressive: the walls may be covered with tiles of fine colour and design, often of symbolic meaning; or with the mosaics of Byzantine workmen. The more elaborate examples of this art have, alas! perished, except where hidden and protected by whitewash. Rarer wall-coverings consist of polished marble.

Niches, imitated from Christian churches but left empty, look half-familiar, half-strange to the Western eye; the borders, except when tiled, are usually elaborately carved in geometric designs; and similar designs, but far richer in execution, and with inlay of ivory or of mother-of-pearl, adorn the woodwork, and in the windows are pierced through thick stucco, whereby the brilliant colours of the glass are softened. Other ornaments, independent of the construction of the building, are great round plaques of a hard green, inscribed with the names of the "Holy Family" (Mohammed, Fatimah, and Ali), and the earliest Caliphs, or with verses from the Koran.

(*b*) The second personal obligation is *Fasting*, which means complete abstinence from food and drink—including smoke—during a whole month called Ramadan, from sunrise to

sunset. Since the ceremonial year consists of twelve lunations with no relation to the seasons, this fasting month may come at any season of the year.

(*c*) The third is *Pilgrimage*—a journey once in a lifetime to the Sanctuary at Meccah, usually followed by one to the Prophet's grave in Medinah. One of the months is called the Month of Pilgrimage, on fixed days of which certain ceremonies are performed; they are familiar from the immortal narrative of BURTON, and the no less vivid and accurate description by KEANE. The sevenfold circuit of the Ka'bah and the kissing of the Black Stone are the culminating ceremonies. All apparently go back to a remote antiquity, and the original associations of most of them can only be divined.

(*d*) For those possessed of means a fourth obligation consists in the payment of *Alms*, *i.e.* an income tax of about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for the support of the poorer members of the community.

It is by no means easy to say to what extent practice in these matters agrees with theory. In the days of the Caliphate the payment of the Alms was enforced, and the amount collected applied in the first place to relief of distress in the district where it was collected; the institution then corresponded with our system of poor-relief. The tendency in modern times has been to leave the matter

to the conscience of the individual. An Alexandrian inquired of the Sayyid Rashid if he might give his alms-money to a hospital where the children of Jews and Christians as well as Moslems were tended; the reply was that such an assignation would deprive the money of its eleemosynary character (in the ceremonial sense), since the law required that it should be devoted to Moslem poor. In Algeria, the Government in certain cases takes the Alms as a tax; the heads of the religious orders try to enforce the payment of the sum appointed by the sacred law to themselves also, for distribution among the poor, on the ground that the duty is not discharged by the government payment. In the Central Asiatic provinces occupied by Russia the Alms had assumed the form of a tax on trade, and was abolished by the new rulers.

The Koran itself makes the obligation to go on pilgrimage dependent on ability, and this condition is naturally variously interpreted. Although the appliances of civilization, steamers and railways, etc., render the journey easier and shorter than before, they by no means render it necessarily cheaper. If every Moslem went on pilgrimage once in his life, supposing the average length of life to be forty years—which is obviously far too high—this would mean the arrival in Meccah of some six million pilgrims yearly. It is

certain that the actual figures do not reach a tenth of this total. Indeed the number of *Hājj* is so small that the title constitutes a distinction, and in some of the out-of-the-way parts of Islam (*e.g.* the Dutch colonial empire) entails various privileges.

The fast of Ramadan is in some countries faithfully kept by the poorer classes, but the wealthier and more enlightened classes have a tendency to shake off this burden, and utilize the various exemptions which the law permits. The same probably holds good of the practice of daily worship.

On this last subject it is no easier to make a general statement than on the question whether Christians go to church. Pious Moslems have at times endeavoured to organize missions to nominally Moslem communities on the ground that they neglected the ceremonies of their religion. Those of us who have associated with Moslems in the East must have known many who performed their devotions regularly, but others who were never seen doing so. The Bedawi in Arabia, says DOUGHTY, "passes for as good as a clerk that can say his formal devotion"; and PALGRAVE asserts the same. Women, according to the former observer, rarely perform it except in Ramadan. In the towns, where the life, especially of the poor, is more under inspection, observance is more usual; but the development of a professional class un-

connected with religion, which is due to European government or influence, probably tends towards neglect, since professional time is valuable; and French indifferentism has powerfully affected European Turkey and Northern Africa. The class who come to Europe for their education often relinquish the habit during their residence in England or France, and probably resume it with difficulty.

For the Shi'ah pilgrimage to the Arabian sanctuaries is rendered difficult and even dangerous, whence they visit the shrines of the Alid martyrs instead. M. AUBIN states that the practice of worship is neglected by them: they start with the principle that the *Imām* (or proper leader of prayer) being absent —for they suppose him to have disappeared, to return at some future date—it is useless to put oneself out in order to take part in an imperfect ceremony.

Prayer (in our sense of the word) is not a personal obligation, but it is recommended. The supplicator should raise his hands to the level of his shoulders, and turn the inside of them towards his face; kneel on his knees, ask for what he wants three times, fold his hands to his breast in the course of his prayer, "as when a beggar asks for food," lower his voice, at the end rub his face with his hands, and say Amen. He should, as in the case of the five daily services, be in a state of legal

purity, and face the sanctuary of Meccah; he should also select a favourable time and place, and be careful both as to the food which he eats before praying and the clothes which he wears.

Age and Sex in Relation to Religious Observances.—Children are to be encouraged to pray at the age of seven, and to be compelled to do so at the age of ten with blows if necessary. Women are excused from praying in a variety of conditions; public prayer in the mosque, which is desirable in the case of males, is not considered so in that of females, nor are the latter required to attend the Friday service. When they attend public prayer, in making up the rows those of women should come behind those of male minors, which again are behind those of full-grown males. Much the same principles apply to the fast of Ramadan. It is incumbent on both sexes, but may be neglected by women for reasons of health, though in that case they should keep a compensatory fast when those reasons no longer exist. A woman may not lead the prayer when men are present. She need not go on pilgrimage unless she either has or can hire suitable companions.

These appear to be the only disqualifications applying to women, and the opinion current at times that *Moslem women have no souls* appears to have no authority; the fact that the ceremonies of religion are incumbent upon

them, so far as the infirmities of their sex permit, shows that they have souls to the same extent as males, viz. for the purpose of entering Paradise. And indeed the same is to be inferred from the poetic dirges on princesses and the cult of female saints.

Holy Days.—On Friday at noon there is a public service which all qualified males should attend. While this goes on, business should be suspended, but the Friday was not intended in other respects to resemble the Jewish Sabbath or even the Christian Sunday. On this occasion there is a discourse in which the name of the religious sovereign should be mentioned.

The two orthodox feast-days are that of the *Break-fast* on the first day of the month which follows Ramadan, and that of the *Sacrifice* on the tenth of the Pilgrim Month. The latter takes its name from the practice of slaying some animal—of size and value varying with the proprietor's means—and distributing a portion of the flesh among the poor; the process is supposed to commemorate the sacrifice of Ishmael, who with most Moslems takes the place of Isaac in the narrative dealing with the abolition of human sacrifices. Both are celebrated in the main as Christians celebrate their feasts: by religious services, banqueting, the purchase of new clothes, and the giving of presents. In some regions it is the practice to visit the

tombs of deceased relatives on these days, and even pass the preceding night in tents pitched over or in the neighbourhood of the graves.

Further, the Prophet's birthday (the 18th of the month Rabi I) is an orthodox holiday. And in Egypt the practice of keeping New Year's Day has recently sprung up.

The Shi'ah communities have a system of feasts and fasts of their own in addition to the above. The practice of keeping the Feast of the Pond (the 18th of the Pilgrim Month), in commemoration of the Prophet's appointment of Ali as his successor, goes back to a fairly early period; in the main, however, the Shi'i commemorations are of a mournful character, as they have for their subject the "murders" (*katl*) of the Prophet's descendants, and according to this sect his lawful successors. The account of these given by M. Eugène Aubin in the *Revue du Monde Musulman* for 1908 is the completest and best that we have. Special solemnity attaches to the first ten days of Muharram (the first month of the year), the culminating ceremonies being on the 10th, which commemorates the death of Husain; the burial of his head at Kerbela is kept in memory on the 20th of the next month, Safar, of which the 27th, 28th, and 29th are marked by the deaths of the Imām Riza, Hasan, and the Prophet; the death of Ali himself falls on Ramadan 21, and the three preceding

days are woeful, because during that period Ali was dying of the assassin's thrust; Fatimah's death renders Jumada I 13 doleful, and that of the Imām Musa Rejeb 25. At one time (according to this writer) the death-day of Omar (the person who is supposed to have kept Ali out of his rights), Rabi I 9, was celebrated as a feast, with fireworks and the burning of Omar in effigy.

Owing to the number and magnitude of the calamities which occurred in the months Muharram and Safar, these are kept by the sect as months of mourning. Preachers of varying ranks narrate the sufferings of the Prophet's descendants, on which there is a large literature, partly historical, partly legendary. The ceremonial of the first ten days of Muharram is highly complicated and elaborate, and embodies practices which go back to remote antiquity; for Moslem archæologists of the fourth Islamic century noticed that the tenth day of the first month in the year was a day of mourning to communities who had never heard of Husain, or indeed of the Prophet himself. "In order to win the popular favour," observes M. AUBIN, "the princes near the throne and the chief dignitaries of the Persian court possess in their palaces *Husainiyyahs*, *i.e.* courts for the gatherings to hear the annual homilies on the sufferings of Husain. For ten days the Husainiyyah is open to the crowd, who are

provided not only with melancholy, but with comforts in the shape of rice, tea, tobacco, and at times money." In the hall provided by one of these dignitaries M. AUBIN states that every day (of these ten) there was a gathering from 3 till 10 or 11 p.m.; preacher after preacher mounted the pulpit, and drew groans from the audience by his harrowing tales; dishes of *pilaw* circulated among the crowd, which, however, was a changing one, as there were many places of the kind which they could visit to be edified and entertained. On the tenth there is a vast assembly in the market-place, and men clad in white slash their faces with sabres—according to M. AUBIN'S informants, in discharge of vows made during the preceding year; in the small city where the present writer witnessed this exhibition, he was told that it was a performance which required skill (in order to avoid seriously injuring the face) and was done for a fee.

The Indo-Germanic affinities of the Persians have led to the production of miracle-plays, called *ta'ziyah* (consolation), whereby the atrocities are more vividly brought home. In Teheran there are theatres specially devoted to these representations; they are circular, with the stage in the middle. The stage-manager is called "the Helper of Weeping," and is a court official. The performances continue for ten days, and include

some topics outside the Alid hagiology, *e.g.* the story of Joseph, but conclude with the martyrdom of Husain.

The duties incumbent on the community as a whole are in the main two—to "command right and forbid wrong," and the *jihād*, or sacred war, the fighting of mankind in general in order to render Islam dominant. The first of these is somewhat vague, but has led to the institution in some communities of an official called the *Censor*. With regard to the second, it can of course be interpreted offensively or defensively; the duty of resisting forcible attempts to abolish Islam, or the duty of imposing Islam or the yoke of Islamic sovereigns on other communities. The latter is the sense in which the orthodox jurists interpret the ordinance; and according to them the sovereign should go on campaign at least once a year. The Moslem should not remain on "hostile land," *i.e.* land which is not under Islamic domination, but quit it if he cannot subdue it. Where territory once held by Moslems has been reclaimed, this last rule has been carried out very extensively; perhaps less in recent times than formerly, since there are said to be $1\frac{1}{4}$ million of Moslems in European countries once provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Yet a large Moorish population remained in Spain after the Moorish domination had been overthrown, and, as we have seen, many millions were

quietly settled for centuries in China. The possible proclamation of a *jihād*, or general rising of Moslems against Christians, has often been employed as a bugbear by European politicians; but the condition of the world is so changed from what it was in the days of the Caliphs that the danger does not appear to be serious. Similarly the Pope retains the right of ordering sovereigns to expel all heretics from their dominions, but is unlikely to use it.

Besides the main obligations there is a list of things lawful and unlawful; by violation of these rules the Moslem renders himself liable to punishment, but he does not, according to the orthodox opinion, forfeit his claim to the name of Moslem thereby. Of forbidden foods the most important is the flesh of the swine; in most places this is as much of an abomination to the Moslem as to the Jew, but there are exceptions. The Moslem inhabitants of the southern part of Kordofan (says ARTIN PASHA) breed herds of swine as if they were sheep, and eat their flesh. In WELLSTED's time a cargo of hams found purchasers at Mascat; and a visitor at a Mohammedan hotel at Kiukiang found pork served to non-Mohammedan guests. In 1872 Russian visitors to the Tekke oasis (in Turkestan) found "horses, cattle, pigs, and fowls wandering about the *kibitkas* (tents)."

The law would appear to permit the flesh only of animals over whom Allah has been named, but there is a text in the Koran which makes the "slaughtering" of Jews and Christians permissible, and the Sunnis avail themselves of this relaxation, but not the Shi'ah. The mode of killing in use among Jewish butchers is also Islamic. Mohammed regarded it as part of his mission to remove some of the prohibitions of the older law, *e.g.* that on camel's flesh, and he ascribed a similar function to Christ.

The prohibition of wine was made in the Medinah period, and though it is ordinarily thought to extend to all intoxicants, there is some difference of opinion. The violation of the rule has been common during all periods of Islam, even some of the Prophet's companions having yielded to the temptation. The Arabic language has as fine a collection of wine-lays as the Greeks once possessed. Probably one may say with truth that intoxication has not often been a vice of the poorer Moslems, but rather of the wealthy and fashionable. A writer in the *Manar*, however, asserts that Moslems of Egypt had become greater topers than the Copts or Europeans resident in that country; and mentions a shop which called itself "The Islamic Tavern," where there was a practice of toasting the saints, similar to one which has often obtained in Christendom. In Persia

the present writer was informed that drunkenness was decidedly prevalent; and the Moslems of the Ottoman Empire are not free from it.

The prohibition of images and representations of animals is rather less severe than that of the Mosaic Law, yet is in the main observed. Some sects permit figures in two dimensions, whereas others forbid them; the art of painting has in consequence to some extent flourished among the Moslems of Persia and India; but there is no question that the plastic art is forbidden. The statue of Ibrahim Pasha in a square of Cairo has therefore given offence, and when it was proposed to commemorate the Moslem nationalist, Mustafa Kamil, by a subscription statue, some of the orthodox were shocked thereby; the supporters of the proposal attributed their scruples to political rivalry. Those who defend the prohibition of reproductive art follow the author of the Book of Wisdom in supposing that the reverence felt for the statues of the dead is likely to lead to idolatry; experience would seem to be against them, for no case is recorded of men kneeling before the statues of Wellington, Peabody, etc., in London. The gods displaced by Islam appear to have been rather fetishes than images, the stones which the pagans worshipped having little or no resemblance to the human form. The taste for and worship

of relics seem to have been acquired, perhaps through Christian influence.

Music and dancing have been forbidden by some ascetics, but the ordinary law is not quite so strict, and permits the employment of certain instruments on special occasions, such as a wedding or a circumcision; but it forbids singing without an instrumental accompaniment, unless it be by camel-drivers. This rule seems indeed to have been far less observed than that which forbids the drinking of wine; and not only has music (of a kind) flourished at most Mohammedan courts, but there exists a considerable literature connected with it; and the ear in many Moslem communities appears to be extraordinarily impressionable to musical expression. Dancing after the European style in couples is shocking to Moslem sentiment; but certain forms of the performance are said to have had the approval of the Prophet and are in consequence tolerated.

The extent, therefore, to which art can be pressed by Islam into the service of religion is exceedingly slight; since sculpture and the pictorial art are absolutely excluded, and no other art is permitted to take their place. The nearest approach to a religious use of music permitted in ordinary acts of devotion is to be found in the chanting of the Koran, to which, however, the term "singing" is not applied, and this performance

is a solo. In the structure and decoration of mosques architecture with geometrical adornment and caligraphy are allowed to luxuriate; that perfume was not employed in religious service is surprising, since that was one of the few worldly things for which the Prophet confessed to a predilection. It will be seen in the sixth chapter that some of the mystics introduce the dance with music into their devotional exercises.

Gaming and games of all sorts seem to be forbidden, though this prohibition is ordinarily disregarded. Thus the code discredits the witness who is "addicted" to chess-playing, but does not define what "addiction" means.

Of matters wherein the Islamic code is laxer than that of European nations, the most remarkable is marriage, since the former permits polygamy, and furnishes great facilities for divorce; for which in the case of the man the pronunciation of a formula is sufficient, whereas the woman can also compel it. The number of concubines is unlimited, though on this subject there is some divergence of opinion; that of wives (*i.e.* freewomen) is limited to four. When the Shi'ah were charged by a Sunni writer with permitting marriage with nine simultaneously, a member of the former sect repudiated the charge with indignation. The use of this privilege is naturally somewhat restricted by economi-

cal considerations; those who have much and those who have nothing can afford to avail themselves of it, whereas those who have moderate means are perforce monogamous. In Egypt polygamy is said to be common in the country, but to be disappearing in the towns. M. Louis Rousseau asserts that in Turkey the proportion of the polygamous to the monogamous is less than one in a thousand. His picture of the Turkish spouse is rose-coloured: "It is in the harem that she reigns; she is there absolutely free and sovereign. Where a women's apartment cannot be provided, what the wife loses *en prestige et en égard* she gains in equality."

Not very much that is certain can be made out about these matters: in general it may be said that in proportion to European influence polygamy has become scarce and the status of woman improved. The reformed Islam appears to defend polygamy only as a temporary expedient, and the Prophet himself is credited by some reformers with advocacy of monogamy.

Nevertheless, among the privileges which, according to the Koran and its commentators, God has bestowed on the male sex are polygamy and the right to divorce. The immediate consequence of this principle is, as Sir W. Muir has well pointed out, the seclusion of women, and the use of the veil (*hijāb*),

which in some countries completely conceals the face, and in Syria takes the form of a hideous mask, whereas in other parts it is almost reduced to a surrogate, being a miniature band over the lower part of the countenance. It would seem, however, that the practice is far less strict in the desert and the country than in the towns, and it is even asserted that in the former it is exceptional rather than regular. The justice of Sir W. Muir's observation is shown by the fact that the evidence is against connecting the practice with the early days of Islam, and indeed the text of the Koran seems by the most natural interpretation to assume that the face will be uncovered, and certain ceremonies of the pilgrimage require that it should be so. Nevertheless, the use of the veil goes back to early times, and, since the same causes produce the same effects, to pre-Islamic antiquity; and the correct defence of it appears to be the public welfare, the veil being a better safeguard against temptation than the general injunction to men not to direct their gaze towards women who do not belong to them. In respectable town society it is improper for the bridegroom to see the bride before the wedding-day; and conversation between the women in a house and male visitors takes place, if at all, through a curtain. Moslem women in European countries usually observe these rules towards their co-

religionists, while neglecting them, at some cost to their own feelings, in the case of European men.

It is of some interest to record the opinion on this subject of a writer in the *Journal of Reformed Islam*. He commences by distinguishing between the real and the false veiling, the latter being that surrogate which has been mentioned, which, so far from concealing the female charms, has a tendency to attract attention to them, and if dexterously manipulated to magnify them unreasonably. This writer finds no fewer than seven evils attending the use of the genuine veil. They are the impossibility of rational selection in marriage; the opportunities which the practice gives for fraud; its interference with the enjoyment of fresh air and healthy exercise; its interference with education; the difficulties which it places in the way of remunerative employment; its injury to family life, by making the partners seek their amusements apart from each other. This in the case of the men naturally leads to their spending a large part of their time in the cafés, amid undesirable associates, and often in vicious dissipation. Finally, there is the well-known principle of human nature which makes the forbidden desirable, whence the veil merely exaggerates the evil which it is intended to cure; for the charms which would by no means be found alluring if revealed are apt

when concealed to be enhanced by the imagination. Of these evils the second is the only one which required any elucidation. It is found in cases of substitution, such as was practised by Laban on Jacob; and indeed it is obvious that the veil and the curtain aid greatly in the concealment of identity. The writer adds that the use of the former also aids perjury in court, since it is easier to be brazen-faced beneath it than when the expression is exposed. In dealing with the first of the evils the writer adds that the veil leads to polygamy; for where the selection of a wife is left to chance, as in other lotteries, people take as many tickets as they can afford.

The general contempt in which women are theoretically held in Islamic countries must be regarded as one of those contradictions in human conduct of which either no account can be given, or only one that is highly complicated. For it is clear, on the one hand, that Islamic thrones have at times been filled by able queens, and that the influence of the queen-mother has in many a court been paramount, to the detriment even of the state. Theologians and jurists of eminence have condescended to sit at the feet of female teachers of tradition, and there are some female names of high repute in the hagiology of Islam. Nevertheless the notion, censured in the Koran, that the birth of a daughter is a misfortune still prevails; and the still more

inhuman idea that the death of a daughter is a blessing is fearlessly expressed by Moslem authors, not as a paradox, but as a commonplace. While therefore the view that the female intellect is hopelessly inferior to the male is even more prevalent in the East than it is in the West, the chivalry which to some extent mitigates that doctrine in civilized Europe is ordinarily wanting in Asia. The practice of early marriage, and in consequence defective education, is said to stunt the female intellect and keep the women in an artificial childhood; and it is probable that the evil which results from this reacts on the males of the community.

The movement, however, in favour of the emancipation of women, which has attracted so much attention in Europe, has not been unrepresented in Moslem countries, European Turkey being here as in other matters in advance of the others. In Egypt the "rights of women" found an able champion in Amin Bey Kasim, who unfortunately died at an early age; his works called attention to the prominence of women in the early history of Islam—the first convert being the Prophet's wife Khadijah—and to the importance of education for the correct discharge of the duties attaching to maternity.

Islamic Theology.—It will be seen in a later chapter that there are numerous Islamic sects, and indeed when men meditate on

theology they are apt to evolve individual opinions; all that we can attempt to do in this section is to enumerate the doctrines which most orthodox Moslems would probably be found to hold—avoiding those which would be current only in unenlightened strata, yet including some that are abandoned by the most enlightened. Ordinarily in these matters the posing of the question precedes the discovery of the answer; and the great instructor of Moslems, as of Jews and Christians, in the art of posing metaphysical questions is Aristotle, on whose Logic and Physics the "Dialectic" (translated *kalām*) of Islam depends. Not all the "First Teacher's" answers are indeed accepted; he was unable to persuade them of the eternity of the world, or, in most cases, of the freedom of the human will; yet in the main the matter of the Mohammedan Dialectic is traceable to the Aristotelian Physics.

The system which results is in no way inferior in subtlety to other systems known in Europe. We may quote in illustration a division of beings into (*a*) what needs neither subject nor determining principle; (*b*) what needs both a subject and a determining principle; (*c*) what needs a determining principle, but not a subject; (*d*) what is in a subject without needing a determining principle. The first of these is God, and the fourth consists of the divine attributes. Of

the divine attributes there are, according to different reckonings, four, five, or six sorts. One sort is constituted by the positive attributes, of which two are power and will. Eternal power means an attribute permitting the creation or destruction, in accordance with the will, of everything possible. The will is an attribute permitting the determining of a possible thing by some quality of which it is capable.

It is quite clear that definitions of this sort convey little meaning, except to persons accustomed to think philosophically. Similarly the orthodox solution of the problem of the freedom of the human will would not be intelligible to every one: it is that all actions are produced by the divine power, but in the case of those which are supposed to be voluntary there is associated with them an accessory power, belonging to the human being, which, however, exercises no effect on the action; so that the human agent is a constrained being in the mould of a free being.

The fully conscious beings recognized by Islam are (1) God, (2) Angels, (3) Mankind, (4) Demons called *Jinn*. The second are called by their Hebrew name, which, like the Greek "angel," means "messenger": an appropriate name in the case of Gabriel, who discharged the duty of communicating to the Prophet the contents of the Eternal Table; less so in other cases, where this

function is not discharged. Of these beings there are vast numbers, several thousands of them having been sent down to take part in some of the Prophet's battles; they were thought of as mounted on heavenly steeds. Their number on these occasions constitutes indeed a difficulty; for such is their superiority to mankind in physical power that one angel would be sufficient to defeat an army of Unbelievers. A few names besides that of Gabriel are known, and, like his, agree with those mentioned in Jewish and Christian documents; two with the Arabic names *Munkar* and *Nakīr* (meaning "the disapproved") question the dead in their graves. Others have the function of recording men's words and deeds.

The *Jinn* are in general regarded as the family of *Iblīs* or *Shaitān*, corresponding in etymology with our "devil" and "Satan," though conversely used, the first as a proper name, and the second as a common noun. Iblīs was created of fire, and refusing to prostrate himself before Adam, who had been made of clay, fell from his high estate, and became the sworn enemy and seducer of mankind. It is his touch which causes the newborn child to cry. He took some part in the persecutions which befell the Prophet; was a party to the plan of assassinating him, and played an ignoble rôle in the battle of Badr. The *Jinn*, who are associated with

him, used to inspire the pagan oracles by conveying information which they had collected, though inaccurately, by listening at the heavenly councils; shooting stars now drive them off when they attempt this. They were not wholly irreclaimable, since some were converted by the Prophet's preaching; and those of these converts whose names are known figure in dictionaries of the Prophet's associates. When they appear in human form they are to be known by the line of their eyes being vertical instead of horizontal.

The attempt to deal with the nature of God has naturally led to much perplexity and to many serious disputes. The words which describe God and man in their relation to each other are master and slave. A slave has naturally to do service, and he must somehow be taught what that service is. Probably most theologians would allow that there were two sources of such knowledge—instinct and revelation: though there are theorists who have endeavoured to deduce the whole from the exercise of the reason.

Some few practices, mainly connected with personal cleanliness, are attributed to natural religion (*fitrah*); in the main mankind have to rely on the intermediaries called *Prophets*, who are armed with miracles in order to convince those who will hear. The first Prophet or Messenger of the kind was Adam; the last is Mohammed whose function differs

in at least two ways from that of his predecessors. In the first place, his mission is addressed to all mankind, whereas theirs (in most cases) was directed to their respective nations only; in the second, their codes were temporary whereas his is final, never to be abrogated. No woman was ever chosen for the prophetic office.

Although there are to be no more prophets, there is a privileged class, to which women may belong, called saints (*walī*, plural *auliyā*). These do not indeed perform miracles, but Nature performs them in their honour, whence these wonders are called "honours" (*karāmāt*). A beneficent power attaches to them, called "blessing" (*barakah*).

Besides their function of communicating the divine will, the Prophets at the Final Judgment will have those of testifying in favour of or against those to whom they were despatched and of interceding, when permission is accorded them for that purpose. So far as the division of the world into Believers and Unbelievers applies, there seems no doubt that only the former can hope for the Moslem Paradise; thus even the Prophet's uncle and protector, Abu Talib, was doomed to torment. Purgatory, then, is only for the Moslem who has earned punishment in the next world, and who, owing to his belief, will probably not be doomed eternally.

The *sanction* of Islam is in the first place

the promise of Paradise and the menace of Hell. In dealing with such matters we are, to use KANT's phrase, overstepping the limits of human reason, whence consistency is impossible. On the one hand, then, the Moslem looks forward to a Day of Judgment, a definite termination of the present dispensation, and the substitution for it of another; on the other hand, it is clear that the Believer enters Paradise immediately after death, and the Unbeliever immediately is transferred to Hell. There need be no inconsistency, because Time may well be an accident of this life. Both Paradise and Hell are painted realistically in the Koran, the former indeed too realistically for modern taste; but there is no doubt that the prospect of immediately entering the Garden has, from the Prophet's first battle onwards, nerved his followers to lay down their lives with ecstasy. The object, however, with which Islam was to be forced on an unwilling world was not the philanthropic one of saving the souls of those who would otherwise be damned—since the Unbeliever was permitted to compound—but the purely religious one of vindicating God's honour—jealousy being a characteristic of the Deity, though this is expressed far less openly in the Koran than in the Old Testament.

The second sanction is the state. The maintenance of religion is no less the business

of the ruler than is the maintenance of order; the two cannot be separated. The sovereign is in the first place the leader of prayer. Apostasy from Islam is punishable with death; failure to embrace Islam involves disabilities. Irreligion and immorality are thought to go together, for the sanctions are identical in the case of pious conduct and of moral conduct.

Islamic Ethics.—Probably few systems dictate with so much detail as Islam the conduct and even the etiquette of life. The reason is that the Prophet's life is regarded as a model to be followed in every respect, and there were persons prepared to state how he conducted himself in all matters, or to repeat utterances of his in commendation or disapproval of procedure in cases which admit of option. Thus the Sayyid al-Bekrī, head of the religious orders in Egypt, who has written a book on conduct for the guidance of his co-religionists, is able to quote sayings of the Prophet's on what seem to us trivial matters: when friends meet and salute, they should not bow, nor should they kiss, but it is right for them to embrace, *i.e.* put their arms round each other's shoulders; if a man sneezes, those who are present should wish him well, and they are justified in doing so even should he sneeze while saying his prayers. Many pious men will not use fork or knife, because the Prophet is not known to have employed those instruments; if they use

them, they will at least hold the fork in the right hand, because it is known that the Prophet ate with his right.

It is not easy to say where etiquette ends and conduct begins; books such as that which has been quoted deal with both. There is a large literature on this subject, and in the main the morality which these moralists enjoin, and for which they quote the authority of the Prophet or the heroes of Islam, is very lofty. Humility, patience, gentleness, refinement of speech, giving good for evil, truthfulness, fidelity, sympathy, respect for poverty and misfortune, care for orphans, attention to the sick, condolence with the bereaved, the suppression of such passions as envy, malice, the desire to defame, and the desire to surpass, are all eloquently and earnestly commended.

That there is a tendency in these works to limit philanthropy to the Islamic brotherhood should perhaps be remarked; yet it is often extended further, at least so as to include the tolerated cults. It is another matter to consider the extent to which this exalted morality prevails in practice. If we endeavour to form an impression from the study of historical documents, it must be confessed that in these we everywhere meet with what shocks us; if we turn to the literature of anecdote and romance, we are equally horrified. It must, however, be remembered that

Europe had its Dark Ages, and that the improved morality of Europe dates from, goes hand-in-hand with, two institutions, democracy and scientific appliances. The public morality of the seventeenth century would not tolerate what was tolerated in the sixteenth; and the influence of the railway in raising the level of morality can be traced in the works of those authors who wrote before and after the invention had become popular. The morality assumed by the novelist of the eighteenth century disgusts the reader of the nineteenth or twentieth. It is not that the religion ever countenanced immorality, but that the control which religion unaided by the two forces which have been named can exercise upon the conduct of the majority appears to be exceedingly limited.

The records of Islamic states present a spectacle of disorder, relieved quite occasionally by the enforcement of order under some strong ruler, at whose death or removal things fell back to their normal condition. The olive, says Sir William Ramsay, cannot thrive on Islamic soil; it has not time to bear fruit, so unstable is the government, so insecure is possession. An expedient whereby Islamic sovereigns have endeavoured to render the government more stable is the slaughter on their accession of all claimants to the throne except themselves, usually of course their brothers. That horrible expedient was in-

tended to meet a real danger, as the history of India sufficiently demonstrates. The Moslem who is out of favour with his Moslem chief expects the worst: whatever cruelty can devise, whatever could by any possibility gratify revenge. The plan of getting rid of opponents or suspects by inviting them to banquets, and then poisoning them or bayoneting them, is a commonplace of Asiatic political science; even the nineteenth century exhibits some notable examples. The men to whose genius and devotion the rise of dynasties has been due have often—we might say ordinarily—been rewarded with assassination, mutilation, or lifelong imprisonment by those whom they served; it was safer on the whole to resist a Sultan than to lay him under an obligation. Those who recount this history have to lay aside all ordinary canons of morality, else the picture would have no lights; they could not write at all if they let themselves be shocked by perfidy or bloodthirstiness, by cruelty or lust. Yet both the Koran and the Tradition forbid the first three, and assign some limits to the fourth.

To illustrate from the region of fiction, the hero and preacher portrayed in the Makamas or Mimes of both Hamadhani and Hariri, is a common thief—to mention only the least of his vices. What seems to be the case is that the general insecurity of life and property in Islamic countries, with the exception per-

haps of the Ottoman Empire and those lands which had come under Christian government, often led to complete demoralization. Where men's fortunes stand in no relation to their conduct this cannot fail to be the result; for though the rule that prosperity varies with virtue has numerous exceptions even in the best-governed countries, these exceptions are not sufficiently numerous or striking to influence conduct generally. Where, on the other hand, quiet and virtuous citizens enjoy no immunity in consequence, they cease to be quiet and virtuous.

By the *stagnation* of Islamic countries a fact is signified which native writers constantly acknowledge, and for which during some decades of years they have been endeavouring to find the cause and the remedy. It is not that those countries have contributed nothing to the common stock of human invention and discovery, but that there has been no continuity of progress such as Europe has for some centuries been witnessing, and that in most lines of activity the Moslems are surpassed by adherents of other religions who live under certain disadvantages in their midst.

Several thinkers have found the solution to this puzzle in the doctrine of *kismet* or "fate." They suppose Moslem effort to be paralysed by the belief that things are fore-ordained, whence energy, unless it happen to take a fortunate direction, is useless; and they even

interpret the name Islam in the sense of resignation to fate. That discontent which is the source of the restless improvement both moral and material of European peoples is therefore stifled by the religious atmosphere.

Although this opinion has been held by experts, there seem to be some obvious objections to it. Like the rest of the Kantian Antinomies, both determinism and the doctrine of the freedom of the will are held by all of us simultaneously; and there is little reason for thinking that Moslems interpret what happens by the unalterable will of God to a much greater extent than others. Resentment at injury, impatience, querulousness, which this doctrine should restrain, are probably less controlled in the East than in the West. Moslem annals show no lack of ambition, of far-reaching schemes, or of the resolute pursuit of aims. Among the most vigorous and enterprising of Europeans are believers in the doctrine of predestination, which does not differ from *kismet*.

In the main, then, we regard this phenomenon as climatic or racial. The superiority enjoyed by the protected communities is not more than usually accrues to a state within a state; the members of the smaller community can count on being favoured by each other, and having their interests reciprocally studied, whereas this cannot be equally the case with the larger community within which

they live. Moreover it is found that disabilities imposed by a government often defeat their end by encouraging those on whom they are imposed to greater industry and more strenuous effort. Finally it is probable that exemption from military service has greatly helped the fortunes of the subject cults.

A peculiarity of the Islamic system is the prohibition of *usury*, or the lending of money for profit. Since the whole of European commerce depends on the banking business, of which usury is the basis, no complicated financial system has ever been worked by Moslems, and even the borrowing of money by governments is a modern institution in Moslem countries. On the one hand this prohibition has had a tendency to concentrate the money-lending business in the hands of subject communities—Armenians, Greeks, Jews, and others. On the other it has given rise to numerous evasions, which, being accompanied with considerable risk, have a tendency to raise the rate of interest. Some examples of the methods of evasion are collected by SCHUYLER in his *Turkestan*. One way is to lend the money without interest, but at the same time sell the borrower a valueless object for the amount which the interest would reach. Another way is to lend the borrower some valueless article and charge for its use.

Islamic Superstitions.—By superstitions we mean beliefs or practices which, whether

countenanced by the official religion or not, are not regarded as appertaining to it, and are despised by the more refined and educated members of the community. These are largely relics of early epochs, and the human race appears to display remarkable uniformity in regard to them; the same objects are found to have magical value throughout the world. Astrology, which has not wholly disappeared from Europe, still carries on an existence in Islamic countries; the late Sultan is said to have had a court astrologer, and the subject is much studied in India. In historical works we sometimes find the astrologer ranged with the philosophers in opposition to the orthodox, but more often he is encouraged by orthodox sovereigns. Other means for discovering the future, such as *raml*, or divination by sand, are generally tolerated. The magical use of texts of the Koran is very widely spread; and indeed, since to a very large proportion of the worshippers the texts of the Sacred Book are meaningless, it is not easy to say where their religious use ceases and their magical use begins; yet to the latter category certainly belongs the practice of using Koranic texts as drugs, the patient being made to drink water in which paper containing such texts had been washed, or actually to swallow the paper on which they were written. This practice is widely spread in Africa, whence charms of the sort, blurred

by frequent usage, are often brought; and M. Doutté, who has published a monumental volume on the magic of Morocco, states that his own patients in that country, associating the healing power with paper, would swallow that in which the powders which he administered were wrapped.

On the whole the official religion was not much more favourable to the black art than the Biblical religion; if, *e.g.*, in Sumatra teachers of magic maintain that it is only their adoption of Islam which has ensured the efficacy of their formulæ, this accommodation of the religion to lucrative and popular practice is not very different from what has happened in other cases; thus Jews in the East have often been adepts at the black art, and the folk-lore of Christian countries is voluminous.

CHAPTER V

ISLAMIC SECTS

THE Prophet is said to have foretold that his community would split into seventy-three sects, of which only one would be orthodox. Professor GOLDZIHER is probably right in thinking that the Prophet's words, if they were his, were to the effect that faith could be manifested in seventy-three ways, this number standing merely for a multitude; and that the interpretation which makes them foretell the divisions of opinion was due to a mistake. Nevertheless those Moslem writers who, following on the footsteps of Epiphanius, treat of heresies, were glad to know *a priori* how many there were; and though their classifications differ in many respects, they have no difficulty about filling in the names. The difficulty is rather to know what heresies should be omitted.

In dealing with Christian sects probably the test which should be employed is intercommunion; where there is intercommunion the parties belong to the same sect. In the case

of Islam the test is ability to pray behind the same *imām*, or leader; and this test is all the truer because it admits a certain amount of elasticity. Thus we regard the division of the law-schools as a division into sects, because there are cases noted in the ordinary law-books in which the members of one school cannot pray behind the *imām* of another; and the late Mufti of Egypt was asked whether such prayer was ordinarily lawful. He replied that it was; but there are others who treat the differences between the schools as far more serious, and would doubtless have given a less liberal answer. The estimation of importance in the case of religious opinions must always be to some extent subjective.

Taking this, then, as the test, we may next divide the sects into ritual, political, and theological. The ritual sects are ordinarily, though not always, mutually tolerant; they differ on matters which permit of variety both in opinion and practice. For there is a Tradition which ascribes to the Deity the words "The differences of My people are a mercy from Me." Only whereas variety is in these cases permitted, it is not proper for the same person to vary; he must enroll himself in one regiment, so to speak, and regularly wear its uniform.

The theory of the Unity of Islam under its divine viceroy causes differences of opinion as to the person and character of this viceroy

to take religious colour. For to obey a false viceroy is to disobey the true viceroy; it is therefore impiety, as being disobedience to God. Theoretically, then, the sects which spring from differences of opinion as to the claims of various pretenders to this office cannot be mutually tolerant, for disobedience to God cannot be tolerated.

Thirdly, there may be divergence of opinion concerning the nature of God and His relations with men. He who asserts or thinks about God what is not true is evidently a blasphemer; and conduct of this kind can clearly not be tolerated by a community whose business it is to propagate, by force if necessary, the true faith. For brief as is the Creed of Islam, the terms which it contains must have some meaning, and he only is a Moslem who assigns them their correct sense. Mutual toleration is therefore theoretically impossible between, *e.g.*, those who hold that the Divine Being has a body and those who hold that He has none, those who hold that man's actions are God's and those who hold that they are his own.

The ritual sects arose from the necessity of codifying practice, which began to be felt when the period of the great conquests was over and the Islamic Empire was settling down. Their founders are respectively Abu Hanifah (head of the Hanefite school), who died A.H. 150; Malik Ibn Anas (head of the

Malekites), who died 179; Shafi'i (head of the Shafeites), who died 204; and Ahmad Ibn Hanbal (head of the Hanbalites), who died 241.

These four are the jurists of orthodox Islam, and any orthodox Moslem is a follower of one of the four. North Africa follows the system of Malik; the Dutch protectorates the system of Shafi'i; the Ottoman Empire and Orthodox India that of Abu Hanifah; the Hanbalites in these days are few, and chiefly to be found in Arabia. All four systems are taught in the university of Islam, the Cairene al-Azhar.

To the outsider the differences between them are for the most part minute and of little consequence; to the Moslem they are considerable. Abu Hanifah has the reputation of being the first to introduce philosophy into jurisprudence; where the Koran furnished no rule, the reason, *i.e.* free thought, should supply what was wanting. Malik has the merit of tabulating the practice of Medinah, the city in which Islam first became the law of an independent community. Shafi'i counts as the founder of the discipline known as "Principles of Jurisprudence"; *i.e.* the formulation of rules, to some extent grammatical, for the interpretation of Koranic precepts. Ahmad Ibn Hanbal represents reaction towards literalism and the restriction of the liberty permitted to the individual judgment.

His system and that of Abu Hanifah constitute the extremes in the two directions. The distribution of the orthodox communities between these four schools was naturally the work of some generations; by about 400 of the Mohammedan era it was accomplished. Other systems going to greater lengths, at least in the direction of literalism, arose and had some following for a time, but were unable to obtain permanent recognition. Astute Sultans conceded equal authority to all four, since it was thereby easier to obtain official approbation for their rulings; if the judge of one school condemned, his rival of another school might absolve.

A few examples may be taken of the differences between the ritual sects from the treatise of the Sayyid al-Bekri, to which reference has already been made. In the case of the minor washing, according to Abu Hanifah, there are four rules and eighteen practices; according to Malik, seven rules and seven preferable practices; according to Shafi'i, six rules and twenty practices; the differences are in reference to the extent of the arm, etc., to be washed, whether the name of God must be pronounced, etc. Somewhat more important are the differences with respect to the "Alms." The payment of this tax, according to Abu Hanifah, is incumbent on every free Moslem possessed of a taxable minimum, who is of age, and of

right mind one day in the year; Malik does not admit the conditions of "age and of sound mind"; Shafi'i agrees, but stipulates that the trustee who pays the tax on behalf of a minor or a person of unsound mind had best keep an account of such payments, to be handed over to the ward after reaching maturity or recovering the use of his reason, in order to prevent disputes in case of either of them adopting the system of Abu Hanifah. Other differences concern points of civil law. According to Malik and Abu Hanifah, the borrower of an article may lend it to some one else without asking the owner's permission; but the followers of Shafi'i make the owner's permission necessary. According to all but Abu Hanifah, a foundling discovered in any Islamic territory is regarded as a Moslem; but in Abu Hanifah's system if he be discovered in a church, synagogue, or village inhabited by a tolerated sect, he is to be regarded as of that sect.

Works have been written reconciling the views of the four Imāms, by showing their special applicability to divers conditions; it is, however, clear that the number of their differences is sufficient to justify the application of the term "sect" to their respective followers. And although the relations between them have ordinarily been friendly, this has by no means been the case always; and the disputes between Hanbalites and

Shafeites constitute a bloody page in the history of Islam.

By the word "orthodox" we have anticipated the primary division into political sects, which dates from the Prophet's death. Its Arabic equivalent is *Sunni*, meaning "of the practice," or precedent; signifying in this context the persons who recognize the legitimacy of the Prophet's first three successors, Abu Bakr, Omar, and Othman. The accounts of the Prophet's last illness and death are obscure in various ways, but they show that his instructions as to the succession were far from clear, if indeed he gave any; the enemies of Abu Bakr assert that he neglected the Prophet's obsequies in order to wrest the succession from the Helpers, or natives of Medinah who set up a claim to it, to the exclusion of the Refugees, or original Moslems of Meccah, who were settled among them. The Medinese candidate was easily driven from the field. A more serious rival to Abu Bakr was to be found in the Prophet's son-in-law Ali, with his wife Fatimah, who represented the Prophet's line; whose claims were met by a tradition that *a prophet left no inheritance*, in virtue of which Abu Bakr confiscated the Prophet's domain.

The supporters of Fatimah and her husband in their claim to the succession were called *the Partisans*, and the dispute between them and the others still divides the Moslem world.

The origin of the dissension is, as we have seen, of extreme simplicity; its progress confronts us with a series of problems. The third successor of the Prophet, Othman, was murdered by conspirators, who proceeded to acclaim Ali. The governor of Syria, Muawiyah, claimed the right to avenge Othman, and a civil war ensued between his party and Ali's, who after a time agreed to refer the matter to arbitration. The records of this arbitration are conflicting and unintelligible: the arbiters were to refer the matter to the Koran in the first place, and if that failed, to the "practice," and indeed general practice, not particular practice; and what this was might well be a matter of doubt. That the murderer of a sovereign has a right to succeed the sovereign is by no means an untenable view of "practice"; this theory was maintained in the case of the Mamluke Sultan Baibars, who murdered his predecessor Kotuz after the latter had won a brilliant victory. The partisans of Ali, however, do their utmost to disconnect his name with the murder of Othman. That the sovereign's natural avenger was his natural successor might also be maintained; what we gather is that the representative of Muawiyah made good his client's cause, whereas the representative of Ali abandoned his.

This historic arbitration also gave rise to a third political sect, the *Khawārij*, whose

leading doctrine was the right of rebellion against an unjust sovereign. They are represented as being ready to embrace the cause of Ali, on condition of his expressing contrition for his "sin," which is said to have been agreeing to the arbitration, but may have been condemnation of the murder of Othman; whether he declined their terms or not, he was compelled to fight them, and inflicted on them a severe defeat. Their doctrine of the right of the subject to rebel involved the dogma that wrong-doing was apostasy, whence they went to the length of slaughtering the wives and children of those Moslems with whom they disagreed. This inference was, however, considerably modified by some of the sects into which the *Khawārij* afterwards branched, and in particular by that which still exists in Oman, called the *Ibadis* after one Abdallah Ibn Ibad, who is supposed to have lived near the end of the Umayyad period.

It is probable that the *Ibadis* preserve the original political doctrine of Islam, in that they hold that the succession is not inherent in any family or tribe. If the historians represent the Kharijis in their relation to Ali as more royalist than the king, and fighting against him because of his surrender of his rights, such an attitude by no means conflicts with experience, and is easily explicable. They might be prepared to recognize the

sovereignty of Ali as the most meritorious Moslem, but not as the Prophet's heir. The orthodox view for many centuries recognized the Abbasids as the Prophet's heirs on the principle which we have seen; the Shi'ah accept the doctrine of heredity, but regard the female line as that in which the right inheres. In rejecting heredity the Ibadis have on their side the tradition which has been quoted.

The Arabian community which keeps up the tradition of this ancient controversy has been rather superficially studied, and among the English travellers WELLSTED, who writes as an amateur, comes off decidedly better than PALGRAVE, who speaks as an expert. The practice of the Moslems of Oman does not seem to differ materially from that of other Moslems, and the reputation for fanatical courage which belonged to the Kharijis of the third century of Islam does not appear to be retained. The most authentic account of their tenets which we possess comes, however, not from Arabia, but from German East Africa, where the sect is also represented. The ritual and other law belonging to it appears from the documents which have been published to differ in no noticeable respect from that of orthodox Islam; the theology and the practices enjoined are the same. It would seem obvious that when this community found the compilation of a code neces-

sary, its jurists might have borrowed from their orthodox neighbours.

Some other places in which relics of the Kharijis survive are in French Africa: the tribe Mezab of the *Cercle* Laghouat in the Sahara, and the inhabitants of the island Jerba, north-west of the Tripolitaine, and of Jebel Nefusa in the south. For many centuries the Kharijis played a prominent part in African affairs; as early as 740 they had won a sufficient number of adherents in the African provinces to organize a general insurrection against the Caliph's governor, in which the Africans were at first successful; in a battle fought near Kairawan in 742, however, they are said to have lost 180,000 men. In 758 Sijilmasa was founded as the capital of a Khariji state, and Kairawan was also seized by a subdivision of the same sect, who proceeded to found an empire, an attempt which was frustrated by the retaking of Kairawan in 762; but the year preceding, another Khariji state was founded in the central Maghrib, with Tiharet for capital. Thus in the early Abbasid period there were in the African provinces several independent states professing different forms of the Khariji doctrine, but really, as M. Mercier observes, representing a revolt of the Berber nation against their Arab conquerors. None of these were of long duration, but Khariji revolts continued to disturb the government

until the foundation of the Fatimide Dynasty; and between the years 942 and 947 that dynasty was nearly wrecked by a Khariji adventurer, Abu Yazid, known as "The Man with the Ass," who took the title Sheikh of the Believers. After his fall part of the sect appear to have retreated to the corners where their relics are still found, and they no longer play a serious part in African history. Their conduct during the period of their prominence exhibited the same ruthlessness which their Eastern brethren displayed.

In the anecdotes told of the Kharijis of both continents they regularly treat their Moslem co-religionists with far greater harshness than the Jews or Christians; a Khariji who had struck a pig belonging to a villager made compensation for it; but they killed Moslem women and children, and made slaves of Moslem men, whereas the ordinary code forbids both these acts.

The remains of the Khariji community of Africa, called Ibadis, came under French rule in the year 1882. The account given of them by those French scholars who have studied the books and conduct of the sect show that they have changed greatly since ancient times. In their territory, or *shabakah* (literally "net"), they are divided into groups of "parishes," of which the centre is a mosque managed by twelve *azzabs*, or "hermits," presided over by a sheikh; three of the former

give instruction, one leads prayer, one calls to prayer, five wash the dead, two look after the revenues of the mosque. The sheikh, with the assistance of the four chief hermits, administers justice to the inhabitants of the "parish."

According to these French authorities the Ibadis not only preach but practise an austere form of morality the like of which is rarely met with in Moslem countries. Even before the communities came under French rule it was not the custom for the authorities to inflict the punishment of death; they were content with fining, corporal chastisement, and excommunication—a serious form of punishment, as it involved banishment for a time. When the council of hermits is satisfied that the delinquent has repented he may be readmitted to communion, but he must make public confession and submit to being publicly lectured. The theologians of the sect object to all but literal interpretations of the Koran, and disapprove of saints, dervishes, religious orders, etc.

Of far greater historical importance is the *Shi'ah*, of which the origin has been seen. Ali enjoyed a disputed sovereignty for a short time, when he fell by an assassin's hand; his eldest son sold his rights to Muawiyah for a good sum of gold. Many years after, his second son Husain headed an insurrection against the Umayyad Abd al-Malik; but he

lost his life in the attempt to regain his grandfather's throne. Even to those who are not adherents of Islam the slaughter of the son of Ali and Fatimah by Mohammedans seems an outrage of the first order; no amount of blood could ever atone for it. But although much was shed for this purpose, the most obvious atonement, the seating of a descendant of the Prophet upon the Caliph's throne, was not made, and the wrongs of the Prophet's house remained in Islam as a festering sore, always liable to cause mischief. Those who were discontented with the existing state of things could always win adherents by championing this cause; and within the family itself there were soon a number of rival lines.

We need only mention those subdivisions of the Shi'ah which have some historical importance. Of these the Zaidis are still to be found in Yemen, and dynasties belonging to their sect have at various times ruled in the country. The Zaid after whom they are called was a grandson of Husain, who headed a revolt against the Umayyads A.H. 122 and lost his life therein. According to his opinion the claim to the succession was inherent in the family of Fatimah, but it must be made good by actual rebellion. Unlike the bulk of the Shi'ah, he regarded the first two successors of the Prophet as legitimate, on the ground that there were special reasons

at the time for the appointment of some one other than Ali, who had shed much Meccan blood and was therefore displeasing to many members of the community.

The Zaidi dynasty of Yemen reigned at Sa'da from about 893–1300, when their realm was incorporated in that of Egypt. The Egyptian suzerains were succeeded by the Turks, who withdrew from Yemen in the year 1630, when the authority of the Zaidis, whose capital was now San'a, was restored; but in 1872 San'a was again occupied by the Turks, and while this book is being written the Ottomans are being besieged in San'a by a force of Arabs anxious to restore the Zaidi government.

Visitors to South Arabia have been rare —the names of NIEBUHR, WREDE, GLASER occur to any Orientalist, but few others; and these have been geographers and archæologists rather than specialists in Mohammedan theology. Quantities of Zaidi literature have, however, been brought from Yemen to Europe, and the Ambrosian Library of Milan is especially rich in this respect. One Zaidi text is now in the course of printing, and if it ever be finished Arabic scholars will be able to collate Zaidi law with that of the other systems. It is not probable that the differences will be found very interesting by outsiders. The point to which allusion has been made is, however, of

great importance, because it presents an intermediate view between the Sunnis and most of the Shi'is on the important question which really divides them—Who is the second best of mankind? Zaid answered with the rest of the Shi'ah, that Ali was: only, holding the doctrine that the best man need not necessarily be sovereign, he was not bound like the others to abhor the memory of Abu Bakr and Omar, but might consistently revere it.

A branch of the Shi'ah which acquired great historical importance were the Ismailis, who claimed descent from Ismail, brother of the Imām Musa, grand-nephew of Zaid, and fourth in line from Husain. The foundation of the Ubaidi Dynasty in North Africa is one of the romances of Islamic history, and the Ubaidallah who founded it, or rather let it be founded for him, claimed descent from this Ismail. His claim appears to have been somewhat shadowy, and such as it was it was questioned whether it belonged to the person who called himself Ubaidallah; for an emissary had gone from Arabia to North Africa to win adherents to the cause of an Ubaidallah who remained in Syrian Salamiah, and only started to take possession of his throne when his forerunner, one Abu Abdallah, of enormous ability as an organizer and strategist, had announced that it was ready to receive him; and it was a question whether Ubai-

dallah ever reached North Africa safely, and had not been made away with before Abu Abdallah came to his rescue. The empire which was thus founded was, however, the greatest which any persons claiming direct descent from the Prophet ever acquired. After making themselves supreme in North Africa, the Ubaidis, or Fatimides, as they are often called after their supposed ancestress Fatimah, obtained possession of Egypt in 969, where they founded its existing capital Cairo; Syria presently became theirs, and for a brief space their sovereignty was acknowledged in Baghdad. To the outrages on Christian shrines in Jerusalem committed by their Caligula, al-Hakim, third of the Egyptian sovereigns of the line, the resentment which produced the Crusades was due.

Although the Fatimide state was governed by a code which in most respects resembled that of the Eastern Caliphate, the form of Shi'ism which it represented contained various mystical elements, as well as extravagances, innocent or dangerous, which appear out of harmony with the general simplicity of Islam. We hear of a long course of initiation into the mysteries of the sect, gradually communicated according as the neophyte proved his capacity. One of the mysteries communicated appears regularly to have been that some one was God incarnate, whether Ali himself or one of his descendants; and

since death could not be ascribed to such a personage, a characteristic doctrine is that of a concealed Imām, or sovereign, falsely supposed to have been dead, yet really alive and prepared at some time to come out of his obscurity and set the world right. Such a concealed Imām is al-Hakim himself, who as a ruler displayed rather the ruthlessness than the beneficence usually associated with omnipotence, but who one day disappeared—*i.e.* was assassinated by some of those whom he had wronged—but whose continual existence is maintained by the Druzes, a sect on the fringe of Islam.

If the name Fatimide is now forgotten in Europe, the word *assassin* keeps up the memory of one branch of this sect. The founder of the Assassins was at first a secret agent of the Fatimides, whose business it was to win adherents to their cause among the subjects of the Eastern Caliphate; presently he took up the cause of one particular branch of the succession, and gathered round him adherents who, intoxicated with a decoction of hemp (*hashish*), whence they derive their European name, saw visions and dreamed dreams, and were blindly obedient to orders. "Assassination" became their fine art, and they would dissimulate for years in order to get the chance of dispatching the victims whom their chief had marked. Oriental sovereigns, when in need of assassins,

would bargain with their chiefs for their employment; and the sovereigns who took their strongholds in Persia and Syria were not willing that so useful an industry should be extinguished.

A branch of the Shi'ah of whom little has ever been heard, yet which at times has been independent, and was finally crushed by Jazzar Pasha, of Napoleonic fame, is located in North Syria in the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon, and for a couple of centuries has borne the name *Matawilah*, of which the origin is obscure. They claim to represent the very earliest form of Shi'ism, their ancestors having been the disciples of one of four persons to whom even in the Prophet's time the name *Shi'ah*, "the partisans," was given, viz. Abu Dharr al-Ghifari, who during the reign of the second Caliph preached in their region the claim of the Prophet's house to the succession and some form of socialism. When the Crusaders had established Latin Christianity in this region, they became tributaries to the Latin ruler of Tyre, and took the Crusaders' side against their Moslem brethren. Their history is obscure, but in the seventeenth century they appear to have been at the height of their power.

The chief home of Shi'ism is, however, Persia, the country in which the rights of the Prophet's household were first asserted, and where Ali found supporters when Syria went

against him and the allegiance of Arabia was doubtful. In that country, too, the propaganda was carried on which led to the establishment of the Abbasid Dynasty, which, as has been seen, at first made common cause with the Alids. The Persian dynasty of the Buyids, which for more than a century controlled the court of Baghdad, theoretically favoured Shi'ah doctrines, though practically they did little to secure their dominance; at times under their rule Shi'is were even treated as non-Moslems and made to pay tribute. Still, in certain parts of Persia the doctrines of the Partisans were too deeply rooted to be affected by such measures; Kuhistan was celebrated for its attachment to these opinions long before the Assassins made it their headquarters. After the fall of the Baghdad Caliphate, when the Mongol conquerors had been converted to Islam, the sovereign Oljaitu adopted the Shi'ite system, and suppressed the mention of the first Caliphs in public prayer; this happened A.D. 1307–8. The argument whereby he was won over was the application of the hereditary principle: it was pointed out to the sovereign that Ali's right to the succession was similar to his own. The form of Shi'ism which he adopted was, as we see, that which made no compromise with the Sunnis; it is known as *Duodenarism*, or the recognition of twelve sovereigns in the Prophet's line, of whom Ali is the only one who

ever really reigned; the twelfth is in concealment, whence the doctrine does not really affect the ruling sovereign's right.

As the official religion of Persia Shi'ism has been maintained since the days of Ismail Safawi, founder of the Safawid Dynasty. Nadir Shah attempted to substitute Sunnism for it, but failed to carry the nation with him. Those who have paid most attention to the religious condition of Persia, are agreed that it is more fanatical than the Islam of the Sunnah; and, as has sometimes been the case with Christians, the detestation of the rival sect is far greater ordinarily than that of rival religions. The Persian Shi'ite regards the food and persons of those who do not belong to his sect as unclean. A doctrine taught in the Koran, and called *takiyyah*, meaning the right to dissemble one's faith when there is danger in avowing it, has been ordinarily popular with Shi'ites, doubtless because their doctrine was often found attractive, yet obviously subversive of governments which professed to be under the sovereignty of a Caliph, since, as we have seen, that title is reserved by Shi'ites for a concealed Imām. Such dissimulation enables the Shi'ites to take part in the pilgrimage to Meccah, yet it is conducted under difficulties. The difference between them and the Sunnis largely finds expression in execration of the names which the Sunnis most reverence: the Pious Caliphs

(with the exception of the fourth), and the founders of the four schools of law, whose views are constantly misrepresented and maligned.

The magnitude of objects, whether of sight or of contemplation, is relative, and appears very different when the spectator is near from its appearance at a distance. The outsider who takes up a Shi'i law-book will find it coincide in the main with a Sunni work of the same kind ; the differences are so minute that they escape all but experts. The attention of those English administrators of Mohammedan law in India who have written on the subject seems concentrated on certain details of the law of inheritance, obviously intended to favour the succession in the female line, and the recognition of " temporary marriage," forbidden by the orthodox schools, yet, if we think of the facilities for divorce which they allow, a matter of only academical importance. The differences in the ritual are not very considerable, the most noticeable being in the formula whereby the faithful are summoned to prayer ; yet this and some others are sufficient to render it improper for the member of one sect to pray behind a leader belonging to the other.

It has been rightly observed that the Shi'ite system closes such avenues to free thought as the Sunnite system leaves ; " consensus of authorities," recognized by the latter as the third source of law, is here superseded by an

esoteric tradition supposed to have been communicated to Ali by his father-in-law and handed down through the Imāms of his line.

Few of the centuries of Islam have been free from some movement with an ostensibly religious aim; we cannot enumerate even all those which acquired some considerable success. Of those which have taken place within the last two centuries some attention is claimed by *Wahhabism*, since it gave rise to two states still existing in central Arabia, and it is not quite obsolete in India. Of the Wahhabi State there are descriptions in some of the most popular books of Arabian travel, for which we are indebted to PALGRAVE, DOUGHTY, and Lady ANNE BLUNT. The Rev. S. M. ZWEMER, one of our few authorities on the Arabs of Arabia, has endeavoured to draw up a list of their doctrines, from which it appears that they are puritans, and to a certain extent ascetics; they abhor the cult of the dead, and consequently visits paid to the graves of saints, which form a prominent part of Moslem practice in most countries; they reject the authority of the founders of the four orthodox sects enumerated above; they adhere to the literal interpretation of the Koran, like an obsolete sect called the *Zahiris*, or "literalists"; they disapprove of the use for personal adornment of silk, jewels, gold and silver, and they taboo tobacco. This last, according to PALGRAVE, is their most

distinctive characteristic; yet Baron EDUARD NOLDE, who visited Haiel, their capital, in 1893, boasts that he not only smoked in the streets of Haiel, but that Wahhabis had the amiability to help him light his cigar; all, it would seem, out of enthusiasm for his magnificent horse.

Wahhabism is named after one Mohammed, son of Abd al-Wahhab, who appears to have been born in the second third of the eighteenth century, and to have started at the little town of 'Iyanah, in central Arabia, a campaign against the local cult of a saint named Sa'd. Being compelled to leave this place in consequence, he retired to the neighbouring Dirāiyyah, where he converted the governor Sa'ud, who decided to place his resources at the disposal of his teacher. This was in 1760. Sa'ud at once started on a campaign against his neighbours, with success nearly as rapid as that of the Founder of Islam. Mohammed Ibn Abd al-Wahhab, who died in 1787, took no part in the civil government of the territory conquered by his adherent, but remained his spiritual adviser.

The Wahhabis at first contented themselves with incorporating into their empire those tribes which were not in immediate connexion with either Persia or the Government of the Hejaz, which recognized the suzerainty of Turkey; it was not until 1793 that they became involved in a conflict with the Sharif

of Meccah, Ghalib, in consequence of their propaganda spreading among his subjects. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Wahhabi chief was sufficiently strong to invade Ottoman territory: in 1801 he sacked Imām Husain, which, as containing a tomb to which pilgrimages were made, was an object of abhorrence to his sect; in 1802 he took Taif, in the neighbourhood of Meccah; and the Turkish leader of the pilgrim caravan had to negotiate with him for permission to enter Meccah. When the pilgrims had retired, the Wahhabis proceeded to attack the sacred city, and after a siege they entered it in May 1803. They failed, however, in attempts on Jeddah and Medinah, and the governor whom they had ejected from Meccah was allowed to return thither. But in 1804 under a new ruler they commenced piracy on a large scale in the Persian Gulf, and sent an army to attack towns on the Euphrates. In the same year they also took Medinah, where they robbed the Prophet's tomb of its treasure, but did not otherwise injure it. By 1807 the whole of Arabia, including Jeddah and the province of Oman, was in their hands. Following the example of the Prophet, the Wahhabi chief, after taking Meccah, forbade access to it on pilgrimage to all Moslems who did not conform to his particular opinions.

In 1809 some English vessels were sent to the Persian Gulf, which put an end to the

Wahhabi piracy; and in the following year Mohammed Ali, secure in his government of Egypt, bethought him of fulfilling a promise which he had made to the Porte of rescuing the sacred cities from the sectarians in possession of them. In 1812 these were recovered, and the pilgrimage could recommence. As, however, in spite of invasions of Arabia by Mohammed Ali himself and his son Tusun, the Wahhabis continued to give trouble, Ibrahim Pasha was sent to storm the capital of the sect, Dirāiyyah, and this, after seven months' siege, he succeeded in doing in 1818.

The victories of Ibrahim Pasha for a time put an end to the Wahhabi State, but the misconduct of the governors sent from Egypt caused the relics of the sect to reassemble under the command of Turki, son of the sovereign who had been defeated and taken prisoner by Ibrahim Pasha, who reconquered some of the central provinces and founded a new capital called Riyad. For services rendered to Turki's successor, one Ibn Rashid was allowed the governorship of Jebel Shumr, in Nejd, and this person's descendants constituted an independent dynasty with Haiel for their capital.

The tenets of the Wahhabis were brought to India by one Sayyid Ahmad of Rai Bareli, in Oudh, who, after starting a sect of his own at Patna, went on pilgrimage to Meccah, where he was converted to Wahhabism. He

then returned to his native place, Bareli, whence he proceeded to Peshawur, and preached a *jihād* against the Sikhs. In 1830 he occupied Peshawur. His success, however, was short-lived, and in 1831 he was killed.

With the death of Sayyid Ahmad, however, his power did not cease, for he was supposed to be in concealment, with the intention of reappearing like the Mahdi of the Shi'ah; and Patna, where he had originally started his career as preacher, became the focus of sedition against the British Government, the Indian Wahhabi preachers finding that their audiences flagged when nothing more was urged than the purification of their lives. From this place a propaganda was carried on among the Moslems both of India and the neighbouring countries, and both before and after the Mutiny the Government of India had much trouble in quieting the disturbances which were thus occasioned.

It would appear that in India the attitude adopted by Wahhabism towards other sects of Islam is more tolerant than that which its founder adopted in Arabia; the sectarians at times identify themselves with the Hanafis, at times with the Shi'ah. The infiltration of Indian Mohammedanism with Hindu or pagan practice appears to be no false charge brought by them against their co-religionists, but to be well attested; their campaign against such practices, whether desirable or not,

would seem to be in accordance with the Prophet's principles.

Of a political sect called the *Murīds*, which gave the Russians great trouble in the middle of last century, and impeded their settlement of the Caucasian provinces, an account equally learned and attractive has been given by Mr. BADDELEY in his *Russian Conquest of the Caucasus*. The doctrines of the Sufis, of which a sketch will be given in the next chapter, had been long current in these regions; but after the Russian annexation of Tchertchen and Daghestan they began to take political shape, for obedience on the part of Moslems to Infidels might well be regarded as impious; as we have seen, an orthodox opinion is that the Moslem should depart from an infidel land if he is not in a position to reduce it. One Kazee Mulla, who had been ordained *Murshid*, or director of seekers after the truth, technically called *murīdūn* (plural of *murīd*), began preaching at Ghimree, in Daghestan, in the year 1827. Among his doctrines was the political theory of the equality of all Believers, among whom the most honourable was the most pious, who only could claim obedience from the rest; and in addition to this he prescribed rigorous abstention from wine. A more important principle than the last was that the local practice connected with the blood-feud, leading to the same complications and evils which

had demanded a remedy from the founder of Islam, should give way before the Prophet's code. In 1829 this personage proclaimed the Jihād, or Holy War; and in 1830 he attacked a town called Arakanee, where he caused all the wine in the place to be poured out—an act which any pious Moslem may perform in a community of his co-religionists. After some considerable successes in the field he was killed in battle in 1832, at the same time when Ghimree was taken by the Russians. Beyond his endeavour to enforce Mohammed's improvements in the matter of the blood-feud, it does not appear that his philanthropy was any greater than that of the pre-existing régime; and the person who succeeded him as leader of the sect, named Hamzad (Hamzah ?), practised Oriental treachery of the grossest kind. Innovations introduced by him were an ordinance against tobacco, and an injunction to his followers to cut their moustaches close. He was killed in 1835 by some of his followers, indignant at his treacherous assassination of a princely family. His follower in the office of head of the sect, named Shamil, was a more considerable personage than either of his predecessors, as he kept the Russians at bay for twenty years, from 1839 to 1859, at one time was master of both these provinces, and inflicted on the Russian generals a long series of defeats. The narrative of his exploits commences with his heroic defence of a

fortress named Akhoulgo, which was finally taken by the Russians at great cost of life and effort; Shamil himself managed to escape, and at various periods in his career seemed to have a charmed life. He possessed great organizing power, and in Mr. Baddeley's opinion exhibited higher qualities than those of a guerilla chief. Episodes which at a later period occurred in the life of the Sudanese Mahdi were anticipated in his, *e.g.* the reference of difficult questions to the decision of the Prophet, who would appear to him in a dream; and there is a tradition that such a phantasm must be that of the Prophet himself, since Satan has no power to assume the Prophet's shape. Although his followers were known, and perhaps called themselves, by the name *Murīd*, which is not very different from the title *Dervish* given to the adherents of the Sudanese Mahdi, it does not appear that his religious views were adopted by many of them; still, during the period of his successes he enforced obedience to his orders by ruthless executions and mutilations.

One sect which is political theoretically rather than practically may close this notice of the political sects. It is that founded by the Sheikh Sanusi, with whose name the modern movement called Panislamism is often connected, though Moslem authorities in Egypt deny the connexion. The founder of this community, one Mohammed Ibn Ali of

Mustaghnam, born about 1791, is said to have first organized it in Meccah in the year 1835, but to have been compelled to quit Arabia in 1843, when he migrated to the Tripolitaine. He had by this time acquired numerous adherents both in Asia and Africa, and received an ovation in Egypt on his way westwards, but declined to make Boulak his headquarters, although a *zawiyah*, or "hermitage," was offered him by the Pasha. In 1855 he established himself at a point called Jaghbub, two or three days' journey from Siwa, and till his death in 1859 was occupied in spreading his system and gaining adherents. According to the French historians of the movement, his doctrine savoured strongly of Wahhabism in respect of its puritanism—*e.g.* prohibition of tobacco and music. Though calling himself a Malikite, he introduced certain alterations in the prayer-ritual, with a rule that the rosary should be carried in the hand, not worn; and like other founders of orders he prescribed a system of religious exercises over and above the regular performance of worship. The practice followed by himself, of receiving visitors only at special hours of the day and after appointment, is also mentioned by his enemies as an innovation and contrary to the custom of the Prophet. In the main, however, his idea was to unite Moslems against European influence, from which he failed to dissociate that of the Turks. In the

heart of Africa, then, he proposed to found an Islamic state, whither all Moslems who wished to be quit of these pernicious influences could resort for refuge. After his death his work was continued by his sons Sheikh al-Mahdi and Mohammed Sharif, who, however, thought fit to adopt a conciliatory attitude towards the Turks. The former in the year 1894 or 1895 secretly left Jaghbub, and established himself in Kafra, in the Eastern Sahara. His death was announced in 1902, but this was denied by many of his followers, on the ground, it was thought, that a Mahdi does not die.

The supposition that the Sanusi chief is accumulating vast stores of arms and ammunition in his remote home, and organizing an army of Moslems throughout the world, is one that has often been circulated by alarmists who have found people willing to believe it. In 1896 a French adventurer, the Marquis de Morès, started from Gabes with the view of traversing the Sahara and reaching Kafra, where he intended offering himself as commander-in-chief to the Mahdi, whose forces he would lead in triumph through the Sudan and Egypt, driving the English into the sea; his small company was massacred by the Tawarik at Beresof, and this danger to the British occupation of Egypt was never realized, nor was it discovered what forces the Mahdi had under his command. Although

the adherents of the Sanusi Mahdi appear to be equal to defending themselves when attacked, their conduct has by no means been such as to justify the contention of the alarmists; M. LE CHÂTELIER is unable to connect them directly with the murders of French exploring parties in the Sahara; indeed he gives the authorities of Jaghbub credit for saving one. In 1885 the Sanusi Mahdi declined to help his rival of Khartum, that Mohammed Ahmad who spread "fire and sword" in the Sudan. Just as they refused assistance to other European nations against the French, so they declined to help the Turks against the Russians. So far as they have interfered in disputes between tribes and governments, it appears to have been with the view of conciliation. When in 1908 an English officer published an alarmist article about the Sanusis in the leading English review, the Egyptian reformer Sayyid RASHID took the trouble to refute it in his own journal.

Theological Sects.—Although there is reason for thinking that the Prophet did not approve of metaphysical discussions—and indeed a Tradition credits him with having forbidden them—shortly after his death they began to occupy the Moslem mind. Some of the historians of heresies maintain that their introduction was due to Persian converts, resentful of the conquest of their country by

the Arabs, who devised this means of ruining Islam; and they adduce evidence to show that the founders of theological sects were largely foreigners or at least the offspring of captive women—an argument which would be more weighty if the same were not the case with most of the great Islamic thinkers and writers. There is no reason for supposing that any such malicious purpose underlay the controversies. One most orthodox theologian finds that the first seven verses of the Koran suggests no fewer than 10,000 questions, whence we can easily imagine that the whole Koran would to any thinking mind have suggested at least a score. And indeed the questions had to be posed before even an orthodox reply could be given. Natural selection had in this case as in others to determine what should last. The school which in relation to some of the most important of these questions eventually became orthodox, underwent fierce persecution in the first half of the third century of Islam; the party which was then triumphant instituted an Inquisition, which distinctly violated the doctrine of the Prophet that Islam was constituted by a simple profession of faith with the tongue, the secret thoughts being only God's concern. The founder of "orthodoxy" in these matters in the Sunni sense is one Abu'l-Hasan al-Ash'ari, who died in the year 330 of Islam.

Two names meet us frequently in the early Islamic centuries as names for groups of sects, though there was much difference between the members of the groups. The *Mu'tazils* ("those who separate themselves"), with whose name pedantic Christians translate the Pharisees of the New Testament, but who retired not from the society of their fellows, but from the lectures of one Hasan of Basrah, were believers in the freedom of the will, with which they associated many other doctrines such as at least indicate hardihood in speculation. So one Mu'tazil theologian maintained that God ordained nothing for eternity, whence Paradise and Hell must both come to an end, and when that happens God will have no power to restore them; that in the next world there will be no longer freedom of the will, whence the beatified will enjoy their pleasures compulsorily because they will no longer be earning reward or punishment. The tendency of these thinkers was greatly to limit the Divine Power, who, according to one of them, could only do what was for man's benefit; whence if an infant stood on the brink of Hell, it could throw itself in, but could not be thrown in by God. Although these theologians accepted the Koran, they often had little respect for tradition; indeed one went so far as to deny that anything could be known about the Prophet or his Companions, since knowledge could only be

by sensation or reasoning, and neither of these could be used in such a case.

Whether the title "freethinkers of Islam" has rightly been assigned to the Mu'tazils or not, the impression produced by the extracts preserved from their voluminous works is that they were intoxicated by the philosophy of Aristotle, and under its influence interpreted the Koran in strange ways. So one theologian, remembering that the primal motor moves things without being moved itself, suggested that the term "to address" might be used of the Divine Being, but not "to talk." Another speculated on the possibility of fire, which "ascends by nature," reaching God's throne. The notion of "a simple essence," learned from the Greek philosophers, occasioned much difficulty in reference to the "Attributes of God," of which not a few are mentioned in the Koran. What relation did the Attributes of God bear to Him? And, since the Koran was the Word of God, what exactly was the import of that phrase? The shibboleth for which men suffered and died in the third century of Islam was a phrase which to us is scarcely intelligible: the creation of the Koran. He who said the Koran was created was a Mu'tazil, and in the first half of the third century orthodox; but by the second half of that century and ever since the conditions have been reversed. To call the Koran

created is regarded as so blasphemous that those who record the controversy at times leave a blank where the word "created" should have stood; so unwilling are they to juxtapose the words. Professor GOLDZIHER holds that some of the theology of the Mu'tazils is still preserved in that of the Shi'ah, and indeed the Shi'ah claim that the Mu'tazil theology is ultimately derived from them.

As might be expected, the number of sub-sects ranged under the name Mu'tazil, or, as they called themselves, "Adherents of Justice and Monotheism," was very large, and included many bizarre opinions, which perhaps were of ephemeral attractiveness. One such sub-sect was founded by one of the greatest of Moslem writers, Jahiz of Basrah, who flourished at the time when Mu'tazilism was most powerful. He ascribed will to man only among beings, but made his actions functions of the body. He denied the possibility of matter being destroyed when it had been once created. The wicked would not, he thought, be sent into the Fire, but the Fire would attract them to itself.

If the relations between providence and the human will were what chiefly occupied the theologians whom we have noticed, the relation of faith to works occupied another sect, called the *Murjites*, whom the classifiers of the sects place next in importance to the

Mu'tazils. The name is said to mean "those who set works after faith in importance," and the definition of "faith" to which many of them are said to have adhered is "knowledge of God with the heart and confession with the tongue." They excluded works from any share in faith, and so thought Paradise could be earned by a conviction and its expression. The orthodox view gives good works (called in Arabic "obediences") considerably greater importance. It is not necessary to go more deeply into the opinions of these sectarians, about whom our authorities are neither copious nor clear. Whereas the Mu'tazil heresy attracted men of eminence at many periods, it does not appear that the Murjites were ever equally distinguished.

Besides these leading heresies many are enumerated, and the limits which mark exclusion from the Islamic community are variously fixed. The definition with which we started justifies us in excluding all sects which regard the revelation produced by Mohammed as superseded by any other; whence the Babis and Behais, of whom much is now heard, are to be excluded. According to our authorities the sub-sects of each of the main heresies mutually charged each other with unbelief, and the principle that members of different religions did not inherit from each other was at times maintained to their own hurt by members of one sect with regard to

those of another. And cases are recorded in which sectarians were treated by sovereigns belonging to another sect as members of tolerated cults. And for this treatment they had reason to be grateful.

CHAPTER VI

PREACHERS, SAINTS, AND ORDERS

Islam, as a religion, has often been commended for its simplicity, since the obligations which it imposes, though considerable, are definite, and the dogmas for which it requires assent are at first sight easily intelligible. If Christianity insists on a new birth, the repudiation of the "old man" for the new, Islam reverts to "natural religion"; its sanctions are, as we have seen, unmistakable and realistic: superiority of caste in this world and the enjoyment of carnal pleasures in the next. It assumes a superiority of male over female, the institution of slavery, even the blood-feud; these things it may endeavour to alleviate by restrictions, but it does not aspire to abolish them. It accepts human coin as the true measure of value, and pays in that coin, whether in this world or in the next.

It will be found that this system involves two assumptions, one of which is partially true, whereas the truth of the other depends on circumstances. A community of which

the basis is the caste system, slavery, and the subjection of women, assumes that it will always have the power to carry out its principles; that assumption in the case of Islam had to give way before modern science and the means which it put into the hands of those who held other principles. On the other hand, while it is true that the majority of mankind deal in ordinary coin, and are guided in their conduct by the prospect of pleasure and pain, there are always some whose theory of life is instinctively different, and others who can with ease be won over to another principle. Such persons, therefore, seek something different from what will satisfy the aspirations of the rest.

The origin of the preacher, the saint, and the order is to be found in this ascetic instinct, which as a fact of human nature cannot be neglected. There are those who are fully prepared to join in the Holy War, but cannot be persuaded to share in the plunder that accrues. And there is a feeling among the multitude that those who refuse the plunder are in some way superior to those who rush upon it.

The earlier traditions rarely represent the Prophet of Islam as an ascetic; with one part of asceticism no writer ever credits him, and such forms of it as he either practised or recommended seem to have been measures of military discipline. Yet even the Koran

suggests that wealth is not the best thing, nor even the delights of Paradise ; the highest thing after which the soul can aspire is the goodwill or satisfaction of God. The preacher, then, is one who insists on this aspect of religion, and the saint or ascetic one who finds special means of winning God's favour and approaching God.

This tendency seems to have been fostered by two foreign influences—Christian asceticism and theosophy in the West, and Oriental mysticism from the regions of Persia and India. The earliest collection of ascetic sermons which has come down to us is evidently indebted to Christian books, whereas the later terminology of asceticism is clearly traceable to India. Two processes are to be distinguished, suitable to different minds—the speculative and the hysterical. The former class endeavour to attain a knowledge of the Divine Being by thought ; the latter by various hypnotizing processes.

The earliest preachers of whom we hear were persons who possessed the not uncommon power of edifying, and in the consciousness of their exalted mission could rebuke kings and governors with impunity.

It is natural that these persons should be deeply versed in the Koran and the Tradition of the Prophet. They could scarcely claim to be independently inspired without violating an Islamic doctrine according to which

Mohammed is the seal of the Prophets; nor did the system ascribe to any members of the community sacerdotal functions and privileges. Since, however, the religious life lay in the close imitation of the Prophet and his immediate followers, those who knew most about those patterns of conduct had the best right to dictate to others. In the words and deeds which they attributed to the Prophet and the Companions they were often, without doubt, victims of a common fallacy: because Mohammed or Abu Bakr had done something, therefore it was right; on the ground of this proposition they argued that because something was right, therefore Mohammed or one of the Companions had said or done it. In this way a vast hagiology arose, wherein maxims, prophecies, acts of virtue and heroism, together with miracles, were attributed to the early champions of Islam, furnishing copious material for edification. Those who felt the need for edification—and it is a common need, deeply grounded in human nature—if they were of high station sent for, or in other cases visited, those who had qualified themselves in this way to administer it.

The Friday Sermon might seem to be the most natural occasion for the communication of edifying matter, but it does not appear ordinarily to have supplied this need adequately. In the early days of Islam it seems to have had worldly and political associations;

the first of the hereditary dynasties was almost divested in the popular mind of any religious character, yet the sovereign was the preacher on these occasions at the metropolitan mosque. Hence the sermon as a part of the Friday religious service had a tendency to become formal and stereotyped, and insufficient to supply the need to which we are referring.

With us the sermon in almost all cases is or professes to be the composition of the person who delivers it, though this has not always been so, and indeed in the Marriage Service the ordinary Prayer-Book provides a Homily which is usually employed. The practice in Islam has varied, but over a considerable area the Homilies of Ibn Nubātah, who died in the year 374 (A.D. 984–5) at Miyyafarikin, in Mesopotamia, have been regularly used by the Friday preachers. They are, as compared with our sermons, exceedingly short, scarcely lasting five minutes; on the other hand, they exhibit an elaboration of form wholly unknown in the Christian Homily. The whole discourse is in short rhyming sentences; at times the rhyming element is a couplet, but the preacher often continues the rhyme through half a dozen or even a dozen clauses. Naturally the thought is of the very simplest, and the rhyming clauses are largely repetitions of the same idea in a variety of synonyms. Some ex-

amples of such sermons are given in Mr. CHENERY's translation of the *Makāmahs* of Hariri (*ob.* 516 or A.D. 1122). Mr. CHENERY indeed found himself roused to enthusiasm by them, and regards one of those which he translated as a model of what such a discourse should be. This is of course a matter for the individual judgment; it is in any case certain that the purpose of the author was rather to illustrate the beauty and wealth of the Arabic language than to edify, and he puts it into the mouth of a notorious evil-liver, whose eye is on the pockets of his audience.

The preacher, then, in the sense of the religious and moral guide, is not the orator of the Friday service at the mosque, but the *Sūfī*, or professional ascetic; whose title means the wearer of wool, which from the time of John the Baptist, and perhaps earlier, represented the least luxurious attire; fine linen and silk were for those who haunted kings' courts. Their function was not to preach (*khataba*), but to admonish (*wa'aza*); this they did at séances (*majālis*), whence the name *séance* is ordinarily that whereby their sermons are designated. Rewards are offered them, but these are proudly refused. To sovereigns and governors they sometimes act in the capacity of father confessors; the Ghaznevide Mahmud, son of Sabuktakin, would rise up when his "monitor" entered

his presence; he took off a tax which he had imposed on the people of Nisabur, because the monitor disapproved of it. Their home is the mosque, and there they gather the "circles" who hang upon their words; in the fourth and fifth centuries of Islam oratories are built for them, and assembly rooms, which presently become multiplied and receive a variety of names, Arabic or foreign. Some, however, prefer the desert and the society of the wild beasts, who venerate them; if not all their lives, yet at least for a period wherein they can discipline themselves, and like the Pythagoreans learn to be silent before they begin to speak. For them the barrier between the seen and the unseen world scarcely exists; they associate freely with "mysterious beings" (*rijāl al-ghaib*); prophets and saints visit them in dreams, or even in waking hours. Their sanctity becomes an asset to the community; living or dead their presence is a protection to it, averting disaster; those whom they bless prosper, those whom they curse are doomed.

The merging of the preacher into the miracle-worker is a familiar experience, and the word whereby Islam designates the miracle in these cases indicates the nature of the process. It is an *honour*; Nature associates herself with mankind in paying these persons respect. The respect which sovereigns pay them is justified by that which

Nature pays them. Ordinarily they are poor and homeless; but lest it be supposed that this is involuntary, it can be shown on the one hand—and this may often have been true—that they have abandoned wealth and station, and on the other that Nature is only too anxious to bestow on them anything which they require. Hence there is a literature in the Islamic languages of "Lives of the Saints," which credits its heroes with miracles by no means inferior to those recorded in the Christian hagiologies, only, unlike the latter, giving date and place, and chains of witnesses or recorders. The miracles include restoration to life not only of dead men, but of dead animals, telepathy of various sorts, materialization, knowledge of mysteries, healing of disease, thought-reading, etc. Those who put the powers of the saints to the test simply out of incredulity are seriously worsted in the process; whereas belief in them is rewarded by the granting of what is required. This gives us one of the sources to which the charlatanry of modern members of orders can be traced; *e.g.* playing with serpents whose poison has been removed, or riding a specially trained horse over prostrate worshippers. Yet this source is not in origin connected with charlatanry, but with hypnotism and the peculiar form of logic which has been noticed.

And just as for themselves the barrier

between life and death is broken down, so after death the bodies of these saints discharge much the same functions as those which they discharged in life. Their graves are their oratories, where they continue their devotions. There are days, ordinarily Fridays, whereon they receive visitors, whom sometimes they entertain with food and drink; if visits are not paid them, they appear at times in dreams to complain of this neglect.

It is clear that the theory of saintliness is much the same the whole world over, except that it derives a particular colour from the religion with which it is associated. The saint is one who has overcome the world. To " put on wool " was the Islamic equivalent of entering the monastic life; a course often taken by men who had a natural aptitude for it, but not unfrequently by persons who had enjoyed the world and grown tired of such enjoyment, and others who would gladly have enjoyed it, but being precluded by hard fortune made a virtue of necessity. Thus the classical poet of asceticism, Abu' l-Atāhiyah (*ob.* 836) was court-poet in Baghdad before he took to devotion; the hero of Harīrī's Makāmahs, after a life of robbery and dissipation, " puts on wool," and will tell his former associates nothing but to keep death before their eyes; the hagiology of Islam includes men who had lived as brigands before conversion; and perhaps the earliest

historian of Sufism was a man who, in spite of brilliant accomplishments, found failure and poverty dog his footsteps wherever he went.

To the question What shall I do to be saved? these ascetics furnished a more elaborate and to many minds a more adequate reply than that which was offered by the simple formulæ of Islam. Salvation meant in general what it has meant to the mystics of India—"the annihilation of individuality by absorption in the essence of the Deity," and indeed the word "annihilation" came to be the technical term for it. This, though not always clearly formulated, is the aim of the ascetic life, and it was natural that different views should be held both of the mode whereby it could be attained and the signs which marked either its attainment or the progress made in that direction. There were those who were so firmly convinced of their attainment that they expressed their conviction in a form which deeply shocked their orthodox co-religionists; Hallāj, who was executed in 922 in a barbarous manner, is credited with the utterance "I am the Truth, or God." The opinions on these subjects held by different ascetics of eminence became in time sufficiently numerous to form what the Arabs call a science, *i.e.* material which can be systematized and classified. The classical treatises on this subject belong to the

fifth century of Islam. As compared with the Hindus the Moslems exhibit remarkable sobriety both in thought and practice. To the elaborate systems of self-torture which were excogitated in India Mohammedan asceticism offers little that is analogous; the endless repetitions of the same formulæ in particular postures, to which allusion will presently be made, form a far less severe exercise than those associated with the Yogis. The practice of piercing the flesh with sharp instruments, in use among some Moslem orders, appears to serve rather as an indication of arrival at a desired state than to have propitiatory value. On the other hand, the chief treatises on Sufism fail to approach the Indian treatises in power of speculation.

In the main it is probably true that the secret of Sufism is the identity of the world with God, and the problem which it sets itself to solve is the discovery of a process whereby the human being may realize his own identity with the Divine Being. A writer quoted by Malcolm, the historian of Persia, divides the process into four stages—*humanity, travel, knowledge, realization*; and though the terminology may be variable, it is likely that these four stages are generally recognized. Sectarian differences arise in consequence of different processes being adopted with a view to securing the same result; and such include dancing, singing,

solitude, fasting, vegetarianism, and celibacy. That the person who has attained the final stage is emancipated from the law, and that the law is (to use St. Paul's phrase) a schoolmaster, *i.e.* a discipline essentially temporary in character, is probably a common tenet of Sufi sects; but it does not appear that the charge brought against them of antinomianism, or immorality, has often been more than a slander invented by enemies; cases in which the privileges of perfectionism have been enjoyed may indeed have occurred, just as they occur in Europe and England. The inferences drawn by one of the greatest of the Sufis, *al-Sheikh al-Akbar*, "the greatest Sheikh," Ibn Arabi of Murcia, who died in 638/1240, are such as would have been beneficial to Islamic progress had they been generally adopted. One is that mercy to mankind takes precedence of piety to the Creator—a doctrine which bars the door against fanaticism, and anticipates the principle which by KANT and BENTHAM was constituted the basis of legislation. Another consequence, which naturally roused fierce opposition, was the justification of idolatry; for since everything is God, no worshipper has ever worshipped anything else. Doctrines of this sort can of course only be reconciled with the Koran by the most arbitrary misinterpretation; thus the drowning of Pharaoh's hosts is made to mean their attaining to Sufi perfection. The

work in which these remarkable views are set forth, and which is the sacred book of the Akbaris, who take their name from him, claims to have been communicated to its author in a dream by the Prophet Mohammed; but no consistent attempt is made to maintain this literary setting, since the author's own works are occasionally cited in it. Commentaries on it in the three chief languages of Islam are numerous; but at times it has been publicly burned.

The notion that Sufi theology contained matter which was subversive of religion and morality has frequently caused adherents of such doctrines to be persecuted, and it is with the view of avoiding this that all the heroes of Islam are claimed as members of Sufi orders; on the other hand, there are cases in which martyrdom has been welcomed, and stories are current in the lives of the Sufi saints similar to those so common in Christian hagiologies of the miraculous modes whereby they baffled the executioner. Certainly the rules of many of the orders appear to contain principles which are subversive of the state, since they required implicit obedience to the chief of the order, and an undertaking on no account to reveal its mysteries. In the works of Ibn Arabi the temporal supremacy of the Pole, or chief saint of the age, is maintained; and this person is not identical with the head of any Moslem state. Different hierarchies

belong to different systems. MALCOLM's authorities give an interesting one of 356 persons, the lowest rank consisting of 300 "heroes," while the "Pole of Poles" constitutes the head.

English readers have now access to some important monuments of Islamic mysticism in two works—one intended for the general public, Mr. C. FIELD's *Mystics and Saints of Islam*, the other for specialists, MR. NICHOLSON's translation of *The Uncovering of the Veiled*. Both these works present the phenomenon from the point of view which belongs to the mystics themselves; except that the former includes some account of Ghazali (*ob.* 1111), who is rather a preacher and theologian than properly a mystic, and whose treatise called *The Revival of the Religious Sciences* has since its production been perhaps the most popular encyclopædia of Islamic ethics. Like other Islamic homilies, it is very largely a collection of sayings, grouped under different heads, ascribed to the Prophet, eminent Moslems, and sages of other races, and the author has occasionally been blamed for admitting in the first case much that is apocryphal, though this might be defended as homiletic licence. By commencing his studies with this work the Sayyid RASHID claims to have been able to acquire as much theological knowledge in one year as his fellow students could acquire in seven. A

more decidedly homiletic work by the same writer is called *Introspection*, and consists of a series of discourses on the vices, virtues, etc. A casual specimen may be taken: the subject is "piety." Abu'l-Darda asked Ka'b (an early authority on the Bible) what was the most special text, *i.e.* in the Old Testament. He replied: "God says: The desire of the pious to meet Me has lasted long, and I am yet more desirous of meeting them. And side by side with this text is written: Whoso seeketh Me shall find Me, whereas whoso seeketh aught else, shall not find Me. Abu'l-Darda said, I testify that I heard the Prophet say the same. In the history of David it is written: God said unto David: Tell the people of the world that I am the friend of him that loveth Me, and the companion of him that sitteth with Me, and the cheerer of him that cheereth himself with mention of Me, and the associate of him that consorteth with Me, the chooser of him that chooseth Me, and obedient to him that obeyeth Me. No man loveth Me so that I know this for certain from his heart, but I accept him unto Myself, and love him with a love wherein he is surpassed by none of My creatures. Whoso seeketh Me truly shall find Me, and whoso seeketh aught else shall not find Me. Ye people of the world, discard its vanities, and come unto Mine honour and companionship and association. Consort with Me, and I will

consort with you and hasten to love you. For I have created the clay of My friends out of the clay of Abraham My friend, and Moses My interlocutor, and Mohammed My chosen one, and have created the hearts of the desirous out of My light and bestowed on them My glory."

That this passage contains reminiscences of the genuine text of the Old Testament is evident; but they are amplified and overlaid with foreign matter.

The work which Mr. Nicholson has made accessible to English readers is really an encyclopædia of Sufism, including notices of persons who acquired fame as mystics, an account of the twelve sects which the author recognized, and a glossary of technical terms. The term "sects" in this case does not involve, at any rate in ordinary cases, any serious differences as to essentials, but rather as to the relative value of "states." So some preferred the state of religious intoxication to that of religious sobriety, arguing that whereas in the Koran David is said to have killed Goliath, Mohammed is said *not* to have thrown the pebbles at the unbelievers, but to have been an instrument whereby God threw them; on the other hand, it can be argued that Mohammed saw the Divine Presence, whereas a similar vision made Moses faint; and in all cases the perfection is supposed to be on the side of the Islamic Prophet. Some insisted

on the religious value of solitude, others preferred companionship, of whose obligations they had as exalted a notion as Orestes and Pylades; or even one yet loftier—for a Sufi desired to fill Hell himself so that there might be no room there for any of his co-religionists. When a trio were condemned to be executed, each of them wished to suffer the first blow. Some confined the saints' miraculous powers to the state of "intoxication," or, as the spiritualists would call it, "the superior condition"; others held that they could be manifested when the saint was fully conscious, and indeed this question would seem to depend on the comparative value of the two states. Those who regard the saints as the rulers of the world take the latter view.

The reader of this work—and there are many that resemble it in various respects—will feel himself transferred into an atmosphere not altogether unlike that of modern spiritualism, especially those forms of it which are devotional. The matter set forth as fact is so extravagant that M. LE CHÂTELIER's objection to the mystic orders on the ground of their encouraging mental unsoundness appears to be justified. The religious life as here described is clearly such as to unfit him who leads it for any other. The mystics feel a certain amount of sympathy with the Christian ascetics, and even fraternize with them to some extent, while as a rule

absolutely intolerant of any but Moslem theology.

Considerable differences prevailed among authors who were not mystics as to the amount of credence which should be given to the miracles with which these books teem. The general attitude towards them seems to be mildly sceptical; but plain declarations of their mendacity are apt to be received with disapproval. And in the case of one of the most extraordinary collections of the kind far less objection was raised to the narratives of miracles than to some of the assertions put into the mouth of the saint. That which gave most offence was a claim that his foot was on the neck of all God's other saints, to which a modern revivalist produced a parallel when he declared that all Europe lay at his feet. We should have the authority of the Gospel for the assertion that it is easier to make such declarations than to restore the dead to life.

The founding of *Orders* cannot easily be traced back earlier than the sixth century of Islam. Abd al-Kadir of Gilan, who died in 1166, is usually credited with founding the first. An order means a society with a particular form of *dhikr*, or worship, in addition to the legal prayers, the members of which are also distinguished by badges; and indeed at this time the Sufis are found wearing a cap (*takiyah*, whence the modern "toque")

and a garment or strip called *khirkah* (literally "rag"), and carrying a staff and wallet —the two latter going back to ancient times. The descendants of Abd al-Kadir are said to have introduced the employment of music as a help to devotion, or rather to hypnotism. That of the dance, in rhythmic circles, such as is practised by some groups of dervishes, is far earlier; from a treatise on natural religion we learn that its intention is to imitate the motions of the heavenly bodies, which Aristotle assured the world must be circular. The employment of poetry, and indeed erotic poetry, as a means of exciting religious emotion is also attested for the sixth century; poetry of the stereotyped erotic character (*i.e.* such as by immemorial custom was prefixed by poets to their eulogies, and purely imaginary) was recited for this purpose by the followers of one Ahmad Rifa'i, a contemporary of Abd al-Kadir. But the next century produced the classical poet of mystic love, Ibn al-Farid, one of the very few Arabic metrical authors of decided poetic genius. Mr. Nicholson in his *History of Arabic Literature* has given an account of him. That this mystic love of the Sufis is always an ethereal passion is asserted by their friends, but denied by their enemies. Early accounts of such "saints" as Abd al-Kadir of Gilan represent their work as somewhat similar to that of the Salvation Army of our times. It is in the

first place revivalist; it addresses itself to the friendless and fallen, and endeavours to reclaim them; it combines attention to their temporal wants with an appeal to their spiritual nature; it wins converts to Islam both from those who have left the fold for all practical purposes and from those—Jews and Christians—who have never been within it. Such a person as Abd al-Kadir, therefore, if any part of the exploits ascribed to him may be believed, discharged a function highly useful to the state and to mankind. It is true that the European is not altogether favourably impressed by a saint with four wives, forty-five children, and probably therefore a staff of concubines; but the service must not be depreciated of one who by the force of his eloquence can turn "the submerged tenth" into peaceful and law-abiding citizens.

The original purpose of the Kadiri order is therefore supposed to have been philanthropic, and the founder's doctrines in respect of meekness and gentleness are compared to those of the Founder of Christianity. And although certain members of the order devote themselves to actual asceticism, membership of it need not interfere with the ordinary course and duties of life.

The other orders are derived from that of the Kadiris, and before the fall of Baghdad that capital was the headquarters of this movement; after its fall they became trans-

ferred to Meccah, and the great succession of orders have emanated thence. The difference between them is in the two respects that have already been noticed; some are speculative rather than ecstatic, and those that are ecstatic resort to a variety of expedients.

The name *dervish*, "mendicant," by which members of the orders are called in some parts of Islam, varies with a number of synonyms, *e.g.* *khwān*, "brethren," in Africa; *fakīr*, "poor man," in India.

The growth of the orders is an obscure subject, and nothing is more remarkable in Islamic history than the speed with which these systems have been propagated. It must be remembered that Eastern peoples are highly impressionable to systematic devotion of any sort; and it is probable that the institution of the pilgrimage, which gathers together crowds of Moslems with their religious emotions kindled to fanaticism, facilitates such propaganda to an extraordinary degree. The observation of G. Jacob, who has treated exhaustively of one important order, the Bektashis, that such systems serve to maintain religions which would otherwise decay, seems to be profound. On the other hand, there is probably some attractiveness to many minds in the fact that all the orders claim to be possessed of esoteric knowledge, only communicable to their own members, who must

go through some training before they are fitted to receive it. The desire to be possessed of secret information is a common weakness of human nature. According to French writers public opinion in African Islam is strongly in favour of each individual belonging to some order or other, and not a little external pressure is brought to bear on those who are not enrolled. Owing to these various causes, the numbers of Moslems enrolled in orders is said to be very large; the head of the orders in Egypt put it at 100,000,000,000, which obviously is an exaggeration; but the suggested correction to 100,000,000 must also be far too high. There are, however, provinces where the whole population is said to belong to an order, which therefore becomes synonymous with a sect.

The centre of an order is a *Zāwiyah*, often commencing as the oratory of the founder, and afterwards containing his tomb; for the ground over which a man lived, often with the Moslems has the custody of his remains. The "generalship" of the order is usually strictly hereditary; where, as in the case of Ahmad al-Rifa'i, there was no direct heir, it is inherited by a collateral branch. The *barakah*, or divine blessing, is inherent in the line; in ordinary cases even actual misconduct does not forfeit it. The sheikh's sons are usually those by whom his order is propagated: they inherit both his worldly and

his spiritual possessions at his death. The chief and founder of the order bears the title *sheikh*; sometimes this title is given to his successors, who at times are satisfied with the name *khalīfah*, or "deputy"; to the local branches there is assigned in each case a chief called *mukaddam*, or "prefect." The revenues belonging to a *zāwiyah* are in charge of a custodian, or *wakīl*. These revenues are the product of whatever has been settled on the *zāwiyah* by the faithful—at times the rents of houses or shops, more often lands. Presents besides are brought by visitors, and others take the form of vows; in places it is possible for the heads to impose something like a regular tax on the members of the order. In the official account of the orders of French North Africa we hear much about the open house maintained at some of these *zāwiyahs*: of their stores of grain accumulated against times of famine, and then liberally dispensed to the starving population, who in better times refund what they have received; of the feasts there celebrated, when beasts are slaughtered but their places filled by others brought as gifts.

Obligations of the Orders.—In every order there is some sort of hierarchy among the members, and a period of probation for those who wish to join it. This period varies in length, and the ceremonies are at times difficult; fasting is naturally a common

requisition, at times personal torture of different sorts is added.

Meetings of the members of an order are held periodically, and called *hadrahs*. Some orders admit women to membership, and these in some cases take part in the assemblies. The birthday of the founder of the order is in most cases the feast of the cult, which is said at times to degenerate into an orgy. On such an occasion there used to be in Cairo the ceremony called *doseh*, or "trampling," when the head of the order rode his horse over the backs of the members, but, as has been said, with a variety of precautions to prevent disaster.

Some of the orders claim to work miracles, especially that named after the Ahmad Rifa'i who has been mentioned. The theory associated with his name is that asceticism gives the ascetic complete power over nature; whence miracles are ascribed to him which are evidently intended to surpass those recorded in the New Testament; having fed a multitude with fishes which jump out of the Tigris for his sake, he restores the "fragments that remain" into complete fish, and puts them back into the river. A mysterious being flies down and demands food of the Sheikh; a roast goose immediately presents itself, and the Sheikh, taking up two stones, turns them into loaves, steaming as from the oven. Accounts separated by but one genera-

tion from his time ascribe both to him and to his followers the power to ride on lions and enter fiery furnaces, of which, like Abraham, they extinguish the flame. Some of them (writes LANE in the *Modern Egyptians*) "pretend to thrust iron spikes into their eyes and bodies without sustaining an injury; and in appearance they do this, in such a manner as to deceive any person who can believe it possible for a man to do such things in reality. They also break large masses of stone on their chests, eat live coals, glass, etc., and are said to pass swords completely through their bodies and packing-needles through both their cheeks, without suffering any pain or leaving any wound; but such performances are now seldom witnessed."

The position ascribed to the founder in this system is said to be less that of saint than of prophet, *i.e.* of a person in direct communication with or directly emanating from the Deity.

The ways wherein the orders differ from each other are, as has been said, in the nature of the expedients whereby the members endeavour to attain their end. The Nakshabandis, who are widespread, especially in the Ottoman Empire and in the Islamic territory of Russia, are characterized by the *dhikr khafi*, or "secret mention of the Unity." This process was an expedient revealed to a member of the order by al-Khidr, said to be

the Moslem equivalent of Elijah; for he who makes mention of God aloud is seen of men, whereas he who mentions Him in his heart is seen by Satan; safety might be secured by plunging into water when mentioning the Unity in the heart. The description of the *dhikr* of the Nakshabandis at times indicates a more elaborate process, for there are subdivisions of the sect, who differ considerably. "The breath should be held in the stomach, then the syllable *La* should be said in the heart, making it proceed from the navel towards the right side; it should then be protracted till it reaches the right shoulder, the word *Ilah* should then be pronounced on the same side, then *Illallah* towards the left shoulder with energy, the head following the movement." Another description is as follows: "In mentioning the Unity—and this is to be done from 5,000 to 10,000 times a day—the devotee should close his eyes and mouth, placing the upper teeth over the lower, press his tongue against the roof of his mouth, retain his breath, and make mention of the Unity with his heart, not with his tongue, by beginning with *La* from beneath his navel, and raising it to his brain, and with the word *Ilah* from his brain down to his shoulder, then strike *Illallah* with a motion of the head upon the 'conical heart' until the heat thereof reaches unto all his members. This should be said by the

devotee without conception of the sense till the aspirant can say it twenty-one or twenty-three times in a single breath. Then he may imagine the sense." The "conical heart" of the above description is defined as "a drop of blood in the middle of a conical piece of flesh opposite the left breast." This is one of eleven practices prescribed to the Nakshabandis, most of which are called by Persian names, not always perfectly intelligible: the tendency is to give them allegorical rather than literal interpretations, but some, *e.g.* "looking at the feet," "travelling in the home," are fairly clear; the latter apparently means to avoid travelling, but on the other hand to be like a stranger in your own country. Another "loneliness in company" is similar.

"The majority of Moslem Albanians," says Sir Charles Eliot, "belong to the Bektashi dervishes," a widespread order on which we possess an exhaustive study by the Erlangen Professor G. Jacob. It was founded at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and originally involved celibacy; dervishes still bore their ears on the threshold of the founder's tomb in token that they undertake this obligation. The sect is regarded by the last authority cited as a sort of Islamized Christianity; clear traces of the doctrine of the Trinity, of Mariolatry, and of the veneration of the Twelve Apostles can be found in its

tenets. The ceremonies contain suggestions of Confession, Absolution, the Lenten Fast, and even the Holy Communion. They hold their religious services, in some places, behind closed doors, and in this some other sects agree with them. The origin of the variety in this matter is said to go back to a difference of opinion as to a historic fact. When the Prophet revealed to some of his chosen followers the formula of the Unity in the way described, according to some the door of his room was open, according to others it was closed, but the room was lighted, according to yet others it was closed and there was darkness. The followers of the different traditions model their practice accordingly.

Probably the newest order of any considerable importance is the *Melami*, which takes its name from a word meaning " blame," and is said to refer to willingness to incur blame in the cause of God. The adherents of this order are said to distinguish themselves by neglect of external ceremonies and rites such as have been described. They are thought to have encouraged liberal opinion, especially in Macedonia, and are even credited with having brought about the revolution in Turkey.

Politics are too closely associated with religion in Eastern countries to permit of the orders playing a purely religious rôle; although

therefore that which is played by those with which we are dealing is less conspicuous than that of the sects mentioned in the last chapter, many of these count as political factors. French writers ordinarily attribute to all orders the desire to oppose Europeanism, and to keep before the eyes of their adherents the idea of an Islamic world, or at least an Asia and Africa purged of Frankish influence and institutions. The *Tijanis* of North Africa used to be mentioned as an exceptional case of an order which has favoured the power of France. M. Israel Hamet, however, in his account of the French Moslems of North Africa, takes a far more favourable view of their work in relation to the reforms introduced by foreigners. He holds that since the French conquest the orders represented in Africa have had far more to do with maintaining their organizations against internal competition than with embarrassing the new administration; and he cites numerous cases wherein the influence of the orders has been to suppress fanaticism, and even to aid the French in extending their empire. In 1879 on the occasion of a local insurrection at Aurès the sheikh of the Kadiris (followers of Abd al-Kadir) of Menaa exhibited exemplary devotion to the Government; his son was killed fighting in the ranks of France. Another head of this order was killed in battle on the French side, at Sharwin, March 2, 1901. A

head of the Taibi order at Wazzan married an English lady, who, dressed in European fashion, used to collect for the order among the Algerian Moslems. In another case a French lady married the head of a *zāwiyeh*, "at Kurdan, 70 kilometers' distance from Laghouat, a fine house built in European style, surrounded with trees and well-cultivated gardens, owing to the activity of Mme. Aurélie (the wife of the principal), who has received the decoration of *Mérite Agricole*." It is noticeable that according to this writer the relations between the African orders and the Turkish Government were far less friendly.

Early in the nineteenth century the orders were centralized by the Ottoman Government, and put in each country under a responsible chief, called *Sheikh al-turuk*. The treatise on conduct by the chief of the orders in Egypt has already been cited; it is, as we have seen, an advanced code of ethics. The reformed Islam of that country discourages now the practices whereby the Sufis endeavour to hypnotize themselves, viz. dancing, singing, and repetition of syllables supposed to represent the divine name. It also has violently attacked the belief in the persistence of living powers in the dead bodies of the saints, a notion which has given rise to an excessive cult of saints, and probably led to not a little charlatanry; for the keeper of the grave of the saint, if the latter be the founder of an

order, has a tendency to acquire influence beyond that of the saint's legitimate successors.

A few words on the prospects of Islam may close this chapter. One statesman prophesied the extinction of Islam within 190 years of the present date. Extinction might mean supersession by some other system, as Paganism was superseded by Christianity and Islam, or it might mean abandonment without a substitute. There is little sign of either prospect being realized.

On the one hand, though the failure of missions should not be exaggerated, it is clear that even where the ground is apparently favourable they make little way. Such places are those in which large masses of Moslems are subject to nominally Christian rulers. The rigid toleration practised by these powers should encourage some to inquire into the nature of the rulers' faith, their own not being endeared to them by persecution. Doubtless such inquiries have been made, but conversion has rarely been the result. The number of persons likely to institute independent theological researches would, however, in no case be large ; conversions on a large scale have ordinarily been effected by rulers of countries, sometimes by the personal magnetism of preachers. That the latter may take effect it is probable that a special environment is requisite. The heat-belt where

Islam thrives is apparently unfavourable to the propagation of Christianity in this way, and it would seem that no other system has ever attempted the displacement of Islam.

The other possibility, the absorption of Islam by Agnosticism, seems even less likely. The number of persons who have lived by this form of creed has at all times been exceedingly small, the reason being that it makes no provision for a number of needs which are felt by the great mass of human beings in their present stage of development; in particular a sanction for the higher morality, a screen from metaphysical abysses, and an armoury against chance. For the first of these religion has the advantage that the notes with which it deals can never be proved valueless; for the second and the third that human demands are not exorbitant. Provided the abyss be screened off, men do not trouble about the solidity of the screen; provided they have the chance of praying, they do not resent the bulk of their prayers being unanswered.

What is therefore to be expected is neither the supersession nor the abolition of Islam, but its accommodation to the conditions imposed upon the world by European science, so far as climatic conditions permit.

This is the aim of Sayyid Ameer Ali and of Sayyid Mohammed Rashid Rida, whose name has so often occurred in these pages. Their

attitude, as it appears to the outsider, may be illustrated thus. We have seen that Islam contemplated as normal institutions slavery and polygamy. The same is the case with the Old Testament, and the attitude of the New Testament towards these matters is at any rate ambiguous. It is, however, certain that both belong to a stage of evolution which is gone by. Both belong to that normal state of warfare for which science and democracy have substituted a normal state of peace. It is the function of religion, which rarely inaugurates legislation, to sanctify and endear it; and if it sanctifies and endears institutions which the advanced ethical science of mankind condemns, it becomes a danger to society to that extent. Just, then, as advancing theology has constantly retained ancient rites, only giving them a new and better meaning, so it should transfer its power of sanctification and endearment from obsolete and barbarous ethics and politics to such as are abreast of the times.

To what extent this is limited by climatic and racial considerations is a matter for research and observation. For if moral conduct be that conduct which preserves and improves the race, it is conceivable that there may be climatic and ethnical variations. And so, too, for the other great functions of religion, screening and comforting, it is possible that just as different systems are

suitable to different minds, so there may be climatic and ethnical areas wherein one system rather than another may be found efficacious. Since religious wars and disabilities have ceased in this country, there has been an unmistakable tendency towards co-operation between different religious communities, but little in the direction of amalgamation. It is possible that the experience of this island may be in miniature the experience of the world at large.

CHAPTER VII

ISLAMIC ART, LITERATURE, AND SCIENCE

Of the six ordinarily recognized fine arts—architecture, sculpture, painting, dancing, music, and poetry—Islam, as has been seen, tabooes the second regularly, and the third in most cases, while discouraging the fourth and the fifth, though in these last cases human nature has been too strong for it. Nevertheless, just as before the late Hamdi Bey, Custodian of the Constantinople Museum, it might have been impossible to name an Islamic painter of eminence, so it does not seem easy to name a musical composer on a great scale; we could, on the other hand, name numerous tune-composers and singers who in their day acquired great fame.

Architecture, of all the arts, comes nearest a craft, whence those who have constructed hierarchies of the arts place it lowest. It is uncertain whether we are entitled to speak of Islamic architecture, though we now possess a library of volumes dealing with "Arabic" or "Mohammedan" art. It seems likely that the architects of the great

Islamic buildings were regularly foreigners, either members of other religions, or converts to Islam from them; and just as we have seen that the church of St. Sophia was copied by mosque-builders throughout the Ottoman Empire, so the same process of copying a pattern seems to have been adopted in the earlier Islamic states. The architecture of Egypt is therefore Coptic, that of the Eastern Caliphate largely Persian. Even for building the simple square Kaabah, according to the tradition, the services of a Coptic architect were required. On the other hand, there is no doubt that Islamic decoration exhibits a considerable amount of originality. This consists largely of elaborate geometrical designs, worked in stone, wood, and mosaic. Three elements have been distinguished—the stalactite, the interlacing, and the ornament proper, consisting in linear involution. To the practised eye the result displays endless variety, to the untrained it is monotonous.

Yet more characteristically Islamic is the employment of caligraphy for ornamentation. The Arabic script was found to lend itself admirably to this purpose, and especially in Persia underwent extraordinary developments. This to some extent has served as a substitute for the reproduction of objects, which is the usual form of decoration where there are no religious objections.

The fine art that remains is poetry, wherein,

if quantity were the standard, the production of the Islamic peoples is equal, if not superior, to that of any other group; Arabic and Persian poets are numbered by the thousand, and the voluminous *History of Ottoman Poetry*, by the late Mr. GIBB, shows that the third Mohammedan language is also very rich in this department. Yet it is observable that the educated European ordinarily knows the names of three Persian poets only, Firdausi, Omar Khayyam, and Hafiz, but could not mention either an Arabic or a Turkish bard. The reason lies in the fact that Arabic—*i.e.* the characteristically Islamic—poetry ended where Greek—*i.e.* characteristically European—poetry began. The phenomena of the former confirm Aristotle's conjecture that the earliest forms of poetry are the Encomium and the Satire, *i.e.* eulogy and vituperation of individuals; but they tell us rather more of the origin of the art than was suggested by the material before Aristotle, viz. that it was magical, just indeed as the Latin *carmen* signifies "spell" as well as "poem." Even now we speak of insults "wounding," and the Arab thought they not only wounded but injured, if any one possessed the gift of hurling them. That was indeed the purpose for which Balaam was summoned, but a miracle caused him to eulogize and so do good instead; and it is probable that the function of the Arab bard was in origin to curse

rather than to bless: even at a late period a *douceur* would make him shift from the one function to the other. But eulogy has also a second origin, viz. in lamentation over the dead, whence it is natural that the earliest dirges which we possess should be ascribed to women.

Both these styles survived in Europe long after higher forms of poetry had been invented; and among the least read volumes which our libraries contain are collections of odes called forth by royal births, weddings, and obsequies. Now, whatever the object of these latter odes may have been—probably it was to give expression to disinterested loyalty—that of the Arabian poets in Islamic times was to earn gratitude from their patrons, and there was in each age a sort of hierarchy of poets, corresponding with the rank of the officials whom they eulogized; when a poet was allowed to recite in public his eulogy of the sovereign, he was at the head of his profession and was rewarded on a royal scale. Now, the theory of the poets is that their eulogies are immortal, whereas the gifts which they received would speedily disappear; and just as the satires were intended to ruin those against whom they were launched, so the eulogy was intended to confer immortality on the prince who paid for it. The difficulty lay in producing anything with a real promise of immortality in reference to persons or

events that would not otherwise be remembered. The number who earned their money by producing verses that lasted and obtained wide circulation was not great; but even in their case it requires considerable training to appreciate their merits, and these are so largely linguistic that translation robs the verses of their charm.

If the conservatism of the East displays itself in any matter, it is in the character of Islamic poetry. Immortality was not sought for by excogitating original forms, but by ingenious variations in such as were stereotyped. The satire in old times and the eulogy at all times start with some amatory verses; during the first century and a half of Islam the women to whom these refer are likely to have been real; after this they were ideal, no more flesh and blood than Horace's Chloes and Lydias—indeed somewhat less, for they have no names, the objection to mentioning women by name being so great that even when dirges were composed on princesses the poet had to substitute for the name the grammatical declension to which it belonged. The purpose of these erotic prologues is indicated by their name, "setting alight"; the poetic flame must be kindled by something, and this was done by imagining a situation likely to set it alight. Either, then, the poet in trance sees the wraith of his lady-love, or accompanied by two (usually

unsympathetic) friends he passes in the desert the ruins of her tribe's encampment. In the case of the dirge this mode of producing fire is not required, the situation itself produces it.

Once it has been kindled, the difficulty is to direct it from the imaginary beloved to the very real hero or *mamduh* (object of eulogy) who is waiting to hear himself admired. Probably the commonest method is to say that the ill-treatment which the poet has received from the disdainful fair one forces him to take refuge with some one, and so he seeks the Protector of all the World; at times the poet cuts the knot, and simply drops the subject of his love-affairs and turns abruptly to the business of the ode. Here, too, the poets show more ingenuity in varying old themes than inventing new ones; at times indeed the hero had done something, *e.g.* won a battle, or founded a city, etc., which can be amplified; but in the majority of cases there was little of this sort to be said. Hence there are a series of traditional compliments which by the exercise of ingenuity can be expressed in a new way; the hero may or perhaps must be compared to a lion, the clouds, the sea, the sun, or even the moon.

Among all the Arabic poets the first place is assigned by almost universal consent to Mutanabbi, encomiast of the Hamdanide prince Saif al-daulah, who lived from A.H. 303–

354 (A.D. 915–965). Many of his poems have been translated into German, but few into any other language. Like Shakespeare, he is a mine of quotations, and indeed collections of his "wit and wisdom" have been made. The former indeed is very considerable, and his merits are very similar to those of Lucan. Probably, however, the Arabic poet more often rises to the sublime.

That Arabic poetry could not rise beyond the styles which have been sketched is in the main due to the unsuitability of the Heat-Belt for continuous intellectual effort, but in part to the elaborate technique which constitutes Arabic versification. When this was invented is wholly unknown; there is no difference between the earliest and the latest poets in this matter. It combines a system of prosody as elaborate as that of Greek, with a rhyming system of its own, to which the ordinary European systems offer no parallel; for this rhyme, which contains numerous elements, pervades the whole poem, and constitutes its unity; an ode is classified by the letter in which it rhymes, and, whether there are two verses or a thousand, this rhyme must be maintained. In Persian the metrical system is far easier, and this may be why that language has produced poetry suitable to the taste of Europe.

Of the drama as a poetic style in Arabic perhaps the only example is a piece composed

for the "shadow-play," *i.e.* a performance behind curtains.

Versification is indeed used for lyrics of various kinds, but in most cases there would be room for these in an encomium; for, as we have seen, love is what is supposed to inspire it. Occasionally the poet is the subject of his own eulogy, and apparently there is no technical objection to introducing verses of the kind into the eulogy of some one else; at times, however, that other person refused to pay for verses of this sort. The poetical epistle, usually taking the form of a remonstrance, is common; but unless we accept the doctrine that versification is poetry, we might not reckon this style with the latter, and if we accepted it we should have to extend the term to "poems" on grammar or the various readings of the Koran. It is best, therefore, to confine Arabic poetry to the three recognized styles called Eulogy, Satire, and Dirge.

The wizard, in spite of his powers, is ordinarily refused admittance into the best society, and when poetry became a recognized profession it was frequently regarded as not quite respectable. One who possessed the power could levy blackmail, since it was worth the expense to pay a poet not to satirize a man of eminence, and we have a curious collection of anecdotes illustrating the lengths to which men were driven by this fear of being made

ridiculous. Legislation was at times attempted with the view of suppressing satire, but it does not appear to have been effective. On the other hand, taking money for ascribing to men virtues which they did not possess at times seemed no reputable mode of earning a livelihood. Hence even those who followed this calling assure their patrons that they are not praising them for any base considerations —not as a rule with any desire to be taken at their word.

The other artistic form of literature is rhymed prose, supposed to have been used in ancient times for oracles, and in historic times employed where choiceness of language was desirable, *e.g.* in solemn speeches and formal epistles. We hear of ministers of state who got so into the habit of composing in rhymed prose that they adhered to this form in ordinary conversation. One of the few Arabic books which has some popularity in Europe, *The Makamahs of Hariri*, is in this style and counts as a model of it. This name might be rendered *Mime*, as the Greek works which have been recently discovered bearing that name are similar in plan, at least to a considerable extent. The inventor of the style among the Arabs was one Ahmad of Hamadhan, known as the Wonder of the Age, possibly in consequence of this invention. He belongs to the fourth century of Islam, and displayed far greater ingenuity

than his more popular imitator. The idea is in some cases to reproduce humorous situations, in the form of a dialogue that is narrated, but more frequently to exhibit the hero executing some linguistic or rhetorical feat. In the main the leading note of the *Makamah* is obtaining alms or goods on false pretences of some sort. Here too the unsuitability of the people for continuous intellectual effort is very noticeable: the inventor's pieces rarely exceed a few pages, and his chief imitator, though he has clearly a greater command of language, has obvious difficulty in excogitating situations, and has often to have recourse to puerilities and occasionally to obscenity. Although, then, the style afforded opportunities for development, little use was made of them; and no other experiments in it besides those that have been mentioned have found many readers.

Artistic prose takes us to the novel, and here it is clear that Islam has furnished the world with one of its classics; for the *Arabian Nights*, though of little honour in their own country, enjoy popularity all over Europe. They consist of an accumulation of tales from many sources, some going back to remote antiquity; in other cases the tale can be shown to be comparatively modern. They are properly the possession of story-tellers, entertainers by hereditary profession, who recite them usually to illiterate audiences;

and they form one volume only in a whole literature of the type, no other volume of which has been found attractive in Europe, though attempts have been made to import some of them. The inability to plan literary works of art on a great scale is no less apparent here than elsewhere. For that reason the literature has produced few proverbial characters of fiction such as abound in the literature of Europe; for a certain amount of space is required for the display of notable qualities of the mind or heart, and none of their tales are sufficiently long to provide it. In the literature of Persia, on which Professor BROWNE has written such admirable volumes, the racial talent for the conception of fiction on a great scale has displayed itself. It is true that some of the Arabic romances are voluminous, occupying over a thousand pages; but such works have no real unity of design, consisting rather of endless repetitions of similar situations. Several of them contain just about the same historical nucleus as the *Arabian Nights*, viz. the names of one or two historical personages, with their correct location in space, if not in time.

The chief literature of entertainment is, however, less artistic than the styles which have been sketched. Arabian taste seems greatly to have favoured the anecdote, often occupying a couple of sentences or less, rarely sufficiently long to fill a page. Collec-

tions of this sort form the branch of literature to which the name which corresponds with *belles lettres* is especially applied, and in the long series of works which bear this title the same matter is constantly dished up. Some authors decline to arrange their collections in any sort of order; the stories are told pell-mell. Several, and these perhaps the most popular, are arranged under various heads; frequently there is some moral design involved and the idea is to illustrate in a series the vices and the virtues or sagacity and folly. At times the author specializes; so we have collections bearing the titles *Stories of the Misers*, and *Stories of the Shrewd*. Such works have a tendency to spread even further and include various scraps of archæology, folk-lore, and even theology; while at times the thread which binds the whole is grammar, lexicology, or some poem, etc., on which the collector professes to comment, while in reality arranging his stores of anecdote. In some cases much valuable matter, either connected with historical personages of importance, or illustrating the lives and condition of the people, has been preserved in this branch of the literature of entertainment. One collection which deserves mention in this context is that of *Anecdotes of Broken-hearted Lovers*, which the author has taken serious trouble to get certified and attested.

From fiction we proceed to history, and this

is undoubtedly the department of literature which may well constitute the boast of all the Islamic peoples, but especially the Arabic-speaking nations. We know the names of close on six hundred Arabic historians for the first eleven centuries of Islam, and possess a great many of their works; many of them are monumental, *e.g.* the *Chronicle of Tabari*, which ends A.H. 302, occupying close on 8,000 pages; certainly rather more than 1,000 of them deal with pre-Islamic history. The classification of Arabic historians made by GIBBON is in the main sound; they are either dry chroniclers, purely objective narrators, or rather reproducers of narrations; or they are flowery orators, who trust to earn gratitude and praise by their manner at least as much as by their matter. In the latter class of work, of course, literary proprietorship exists; it can scarcely be said to do so in the former, whence we find the matter of one historian taken over verbally by another, with perhaps a certain amount of abridgment and occasional comment or elucidation of what is obscure. The greatest monument of Arabic historical writing which we possess is of this sort, viz., the *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir*, ending in the year 627, not much more than a quarter of a century before the fall of Baghdad, which is often thought to mark the end of classical Arabic literature. Although these writers, even the best of them, by no means impress

us with their personal greatness and ability as do the best writers of Greece and Rome and their European successors, they have the great merit in general of both accuracy and veracity; and the level of these was kept higher in Arabic chronicles than in those written either in Persian or Turkish. Naturally the colossal size of some of these works has nothing to do with the question of planning on a great scale; the intellectual effort required for chronicling events is not very great.

The Arabic histories are of various kinds, universal, local, occasional, and personal; most of the great cities of the Islamic empires have their local historians, and we have special chronicles of many an event of special importance or interest, as well as special biographies of distinguished individuals. Thus it is not surprising that we should possess a biography of Saladin, a chronicle of his dynasty, and a special chronicle of the reconquest of Jerusalem. Indeed there is reason for thinking that when Baghdad was a great capital the death of a distinguished man was followed by the publication of his biography nearly as regularly as is the case in this country.

The introduction of the *Index* dates from the invention of printing; before the content of the page was fixed no such institution could exist. Some sort of substitute for this was

found in the composition of dictionaries, *i.e.* works—after the fourth century often in alphabetical order—in which all that was known about groups of persons was put together. It has been remarked that the student of Islamic literature is confronted with more personal names than meet him anywhere else, probably because of the practice, to which allusion has already been made, of maintaining in the case of an assertion of any sort the chain of intermediaries between the author and the last reporter. Hence the Islamic student has on his shelves a whole series of biographical dictionaries; sometimes they are national biographies, sometimes confined to persons who acquired celebrity in some department or were connected with some particular place. The arrangement is at times alphabetical, at others chronological. The Dictionary of National Biography belonging to the eighth century of Islam occupies twenty-five volumes and has never been printed. The popular dictionary of the subject belongs to the century before, and in translation occupies four quartos. Somewhat earlier is an eight-volume dictionary of *savants*, exclusive, however, of poets. The grammarians, physicians, and other classes of men have also found compilers of dictionaries of their biographies; and yet more care has been spent on dictionaries of traditionalists, because of the im-

portance of the matter which these persons had the honour of transmitting to posterity, and the desirability of knowing how they conducted their lives. A dictionary of these in twelve volumes has recently been printed, but there are many more existing in MS.

Near akin to the study of history is that of geography, and this was pursued not only out of curiosity, but for practical purposes; indeed, the vast extension of the Islamic Empire rendered it necessary for the maintenance of the state. Hence we have a whole series of geographical treatises, dating from the third century of Islam, in which the then known world is described, and valuable statistics of various sorts collected. Special attention was naturally paid to the Arabian peninsula, which retained its proud position as the home of Islam, and which every Moslem should visit once in his life; the roads that radiated thither from all parts of the empire are accurately traced, and not a little told us by the way of the manners, customs, and antiquities of the inhabitants of the different countries. In the seventh century of Islam this material was collected and arranged in alphabetical order as a World's Gazetteer. And just as the great cities of the empire produced their historians, so they had their topographers; there are in existence works dealing especially with Cairo and Baghdad which for their accuracy and exhaustiveness

form noble monuments of the national literature. For the seventh and eighth centuries of Islam we possess books of travel, by Ibn Jubair and Ibn Batuta; the latter is a mine of information to archæologists, and has been rendered into more than one European language.

Closely allied with geography is the study of foreign customs and religions, and it is surprising what an amount of pains the Moslem scholars bestowed on these subjects, going in several cases to the length of acquiring foreign and classical languages in order to master them. Many treatises on pagan cults have disappeared; some remain and have either been published or are likely to be. Many of these authors may be said to have anticipated to a considerable extent the scientific attitude of modern "Comparative Religion"; a fact which we may ascribe to the partial toleration of Islam, which, though it inflicted certain disabilities on a number of systems, did not set itself to exterminate them.

Arabian influence in Europe lasted longest in the region of medicine, for which as late as the seventeenth century the study of Arabic was regarded as of considerable importance; and the names of some Arabic authorities on this discipline, such as Rhazes and Avicenna, are still familiar. Though these writers drew most of their material

from the Greeks, they are thought by experts to have made some original contributions; the profession was, however, as has been seen, mainly in the hands of foreigners, whence it lies on the margin of our subject. In general it may be said that Moslem effort was more successful in deductive than in experimental science; and the chief writers on natural history were unable to convince their countrymen that they knew much about the subject. On the other hand, a peculiar form of Natural History which was distinctly Islamic lay in collecting the observations made by poets of the desert on the habits of the animals found in the Arabian peninsula, whence to some extent this study belonged to grammarians and lexicographers rather than to naturalists. In deductive science, however, they made their mark, and certain parts of the Aristotelian system were undoubtedly mastered by the Moslem philosophers, who, as has been seen, had recourse to the First Teacher, as they called him, for help in formulating and discussing the problems which their creed suggested. Through their works the study of Greek philosophy at first revived in Europe, whence their names (in Latin transformations) were at one time more frequently heard in Europe than they are now. It must not indeed be supposed that the Islamic states ordinarily gave much encouragement to the philosopher. He was generally supposed to be a "natur-

alist" in the sense of one who ascribed all things to natural causes, was inclined therefore to eliminate prophecy and miracle, and believed in the eternity of the world. Hence the possession of philosophical books was not altogether safe, and we hear of frequent holocausts of libraries which housed them. The great historian Ibn al-Athir is indignant at the employment of such a man as Avicenna in a high office of state. Even the Jewish writer who won most fame among his co-religionists by codification of the law, and adjusting it to Aristotelian formulæ, is charged by the *Dictionary of Physicians* with infidelity—for Moslems at times evince some interest in the orthodoxy of persons who are not of their community.

In the main, however, Islamic literature and science are theological, *i.e.* bear some direct relation to either the Koran or the Tradition of the Prophet. And indeed the service rendered by the Koran to the Arabian people cannot be overestimated; the fact that theirs was the language in which God Almighty despatched His message to mankind gave them a sense of superiority to the rest of the world, and this in the case of most great nations has at one period been a condition of their progress. That for a time it seemed impious to "add unto the words of the prophecy of this book," *i.e.* to reduce any human utterances to book form and so co-

ordinate them with the Koran, is natural; just as the Divine Being had no associates, so His book, it might be thought, could have no rivals or companions. But although enthusiasm for the Koran increased rather than diminished with the ages, and a believer at this day finds matchless wisdom and eloquence in what such an admirer of Mohammed as Carlyle confessed to be a dull book, in the second century of Islam it came to be recognized that, though the Divine Being has no associates, still He has a court; whence there might be a literature subservient to the Koran, and making no claim to rival it. The belief that a sacred book is literally God's Word furnishes a basis for grammatical and lexicographical study which is wanting where no such belief is maintained; hence the two nations who performed wonders in both these departments of study before comparative grammar or historical etymology were invented were the Hindus and the Moslems. On the one hand the language acquired dignity from the fact that God had used it; on the other the sacred book provided an infallible norm, since there could be no question that its grammar, its usage, and its figures were correct. Numerous anecdotes illustrate the value of the Koran for settling such questions. A man is ridiculed for using the phrase "I saw my brother this morning wanting to die" (meaning at the point of

death); he reminds his critic that in the Koran a wall "wants to fall," and the critic is silenced. A German scholar who had the unlucky idea of demonstrating before an Algerian audience that the Koran was in vulgar Arabic was near causing a tumult.

The theory, then, that the language of the Koran was divine made its language worth studying, and suggested the application to that study of both deductive and inductive methods. By the first is meant the application, as it is sometimes called, of philosophy to grammar, which usually means finding in grammatical forms conscious symbolism; by the latter, accurate observation and tabulation of existing usage. The grammar of Sibawaihi (*ob.* before the end of the second Islamic century) is an extraordinary performance from both points of view; the German translator recommends its study to one who would penetrate to the lowest depths of the Arab, or indeed of the Semitic, nature from the formal side. The Koran professed to be perfect so far as it went, but from its size it could by no means exhaust the Arabic language; that therefore was to be learned from the Arabs, and especially from those of the desert who had not mixed with strangers. The desire therefore to interpret and supplement the language of the Koran suggested the collection and preservation of old lays

and similar relics of antiquity before the archæological interest awoke.

It is indeed true that their wonderful language, which perhaps more than any other gives the appearance of artificiality, easily lent itself to philological systematization; yet the endeavour to subject it to this treatment only commenced when it was believed to be God's language. And although some help for the commencement of these studies was doubtless obtained from Greece and Syria—Dr. SARRUF has plausibly suggested that the name of JOANNES GRAMMATICUS lies behind the Arabic name for "Grammar"—the elaboration of the system is entirely due to Islamic effort.

That historical criticism, called in German *Quellenkritik*, or "criticism of the sources," is an Islamic invention has been seen in the sketch of Tradition given above. It is to be traced in part at any rate to the notion of accuracy resulting from the belief in the literal inspiration of the Koran, and easily spreading thence to the Prophet's words, which, if not inspired in the same sense, were no less infallible. It might not be easy to find the principle formulated before Islamic times, that historical knowledge can have only three sources—divine communication or inspiration, personal witnessing, or communication from witnesses; and that the value of the last of the three depends entirely on

the competence and the good faith of the witness. The modern historical page with a footnote for each sentence, referring to the authority for the statement in the text, is therefore in the Islamic style; its advantage is not so much security from error as that it facilitates the detection of it because the stream does not profess to rise above the source. When, therefore, Moslems have held controversy with members of other communities, and the question has been confined to authenticity, the controversialist who is in possession of no *isnād*, or chain of trustworthy authorities, has been at a disadvantage, and Jewish theologians were at last compelled to excogitate a chain of authorities through whom the Law of Moses had been handed down through the ages to themselves.

So long as history consists of the reproduction of words and deeds, there is no chance of improving on the Islamic method; but the philosophy of history, or generalization about human conduct by observing the recurrence of sequences, was also easier to the Islamic thinkers than others, owing to the mass of accurately recorded history which lay ready to hand. It is true that the compass of such generalization was seriously contracted by the monotony of the matter thus collected; there was none of the exuberant variety of political experience which formed the basis of the Aristotelian

Politics. Yet the philosophy of history by Ibn Khaldun, who died early in the ninth century of Islam, of which there is a French translation, may well count among the classics in its subject, and is of permanent value for the understanding of Oriental politics, somewhat as Aristotle's work is for that of Greek. On this subject, too, the Islamic peoples would gladly have learned from the Greeks if they had had a teacher; but those who professed to teach them had not themselves learned.

That the Koran, owing to the historical materials which it contains, encouraged archæological inquiry should also be acknowledged; for curiosity was naturally aroused in reference to the personages whose names recur so constantly in its pages, and those who professed to know something about them in consequence obtained a hearing, though of course they were not ordinarily believed where they contradicted that infallible record. The practice of collating the Jewish and Christian narratives with those embodied in the Koran, and to some extent interpreting the latter by the former, found many adherents, though perhaps not generally approved; and mediæval Islam has some wonderful performances in lines closely connected with this. As then, all other studies might be regarded as subservient to that of the Word of God, it is probable that in the interminable series of

commentaries on the Koran we find the product of the mightiest Islamic minds. And it is mainly in this form that the ideas of the most notable Islamic reformer of our time, the Mufti MOHAMMED ABDO, are perpetuated.

The number of titles of Islamic books collected by a bibliographer of the eleventh Islamic century came to over 15,000, one of these being in 470 volumes, and many in fifty or more. It is not therefore possible to give more than the faintest outline of their contents in a few pages; but there are now lucid treatises on Islamic literature in the four chief languages of Europe.

In the future it is probable that European models will more and more dominate the literature of the Islamic countries, and our classics are being put into Islamic dress. A friend of the writer has devoted part of his life to rendering Shakespeare into Turkish; another has performed the wonderful achievement of putting the Iliad into Arabic verse. The East, in taking from the West, consoles itself with the thought that it is taking back its own.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SO FAR AS POSSIBLE CONFINED TO ENGLISH BOOKS

For Chapter I

The Statesman's Year-book.

The Mohammedan World of To-day. Edited by S. M. Zwemer, etc. 1906.

T. W. Arnold: The Preaching of Islam. London, 1896.

Sir C. Eliot: Turkey in Europe. 1908.

E. G. Browne: The Persian Revolution. 1911.

Budgett Meakin: The Moorish Empire. 1899.

Sir W. W. Hunter: The Indian Empire. 1882.

G. B. Malleson: History of Afghanistan. 1879.

Angus Hamilton: Afghanistan. 1906.

Lord Cromer: Modern Egypt. London, 1908.

Artin Pasha: England in the Sudan. 1911.

E. Cat: Histoire de l'Algérie. 1889.

F. H. Skrine: The Expansion of Russia. 1903.

P. J. Veth: Java, geographisch, ethnologisch, historisch, 1903.

Marshall Broomhall: Islam in China. 1910.

G. P. Badger: History of the Imams and Sayyids of Oman. 1871.

For Chapter II

Sir W. Muir : The Life of Mahomet. 1878, etc.

Syed Ameer Ali : The Spirit of Islam. 1896.

D. S. Margoliouth : Mohammed and the Rise of Islam. 1906, etc.

The Koran : Translated by Sale, Rodwell, and Palmer.

H. Preserved Smith : The Bible and Islam. 1897.

W. St. Clair Tisdall : The Original Sources of the Koran. 1905.

For Chapter III

Sir W. Muir : The Caliphate, Its Rise, Decline, and Fall. 1891.

S. Lane Poole: The Mohammedan Dynasties. 1894.

For Chapter IV

E. Sell : The Faith of Islam. 1897.

E. W. Lane : The Modern Egyptians. 1871, etc.

D. B. Macdonald : Development of Muslim Theology, etc. 1903.

J. Hastings : Dictionary of Religion and Ethics.

A van Sommer and S. M. Zwemer : Our Moslem Sisters. 1907.

For Chapter V

Sir R. K. Wilson : Digest of Anglo-Mohammedan Law. 1908.

Syed Ameer Ali : The Personal Law of the Mohammedans, etc. 1880

Ibn Khaldoun : Prolégomènes. Translated by De Slane.

J. L. Baddeley : The Russian Conquest of the Caucasus. 1909.

W. G. Palgrave : Central and Eastern Arabia. 1865.

For Chapter VI

Kashf al-Mahjub: Translated by R. A. Nicholson. 1911.

E. Sell: The Religious Orders of Islam. 1908.

C. Field: Mystics and Saints of Islam. 1910.

J. C. Oman: Brahmins, Theists, and Muslims of India. 1907.

I. Hamet: Les Musulmans français du Nord de l'Afrique. 1906.

For Chapter VII

E. G. Browne: A Literary History of Persia. 1906, etc.

R. A. Nicholson: A Literary History of the Arabs. 1907.

Ibn Khallikan's Biographical Dictionary. Translated by De Slane. 1842, etc.

E. J. W. Gibb: History of Ottoman Poetry. 1900–1907.

Printed by Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ld., London and Aylesbury.

Date Due

SEP 2 5 '59

DEC 12

MAR 15 '62

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject

GTU Library
3 2400 00730 7014

1. No b
withou
Borrow
done to the volumes while in their possession and are expected to make good all losses.
2. (a) **Reserve Books** may be borrowed for a period of two hours. In case no call has been made in the interval, books may be renewed for a second two hours. (Where there is only one copy, book must be used in the library.)
(b) Reserve books taken at 10 p.m. Mondays to Fridays are due at 9 a.m. the next morning. A reserve book taken from the library at 12 m. Saturday is due at 9 a.m. the following Monday.
3. Books not on reserve may be drawn from the library for two weeks and may be renewed once for the same period, except one-day books.
4. A fine of five cents a day will be charged on each book which is not returned according to the above rule.
5. **MAGAZINES ARE NOT** to be taken from the library.
6. Infringement of these rules may lead to withdrawal of library privileges.

OT24
M33
m